

EXISTENCE AND SPECTRAL THEORY FOR WEAK SOLUTIONS OF NEUMANN AND DIRICHLET PROBLEMS FOR LINEAR DEGENERATE ELLIPTIC OPERATORS WITH ROUGH COEFFICIENTS

D. D. MONTICELLI¹ AND S. RODNEY²

ABSTRACT. In this paper we study existence and spectral properties for weak solutions of Neumann and Dirichlet problems associated to second order linear degenerate elliptic partial differential operators X , with rough coefficients of the form

$$X = -\operatorname{div}(P\nabla) + \mathbf{H}\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{S}'\mathbf{G} + F$$

in a geometric homogeneous space setting where the $n \times n$ matrix function $P = P(x)$ is allowed to degenerate. We give a maximum principle for weak solutions of $Xu \leq 0$ and follow this with a result describing a relationship between compact projection of the degenerate Sobolev space $QH^{1,p}$ into L^q and a Poincaré inequality with gain adapted to Q .

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper studies existence of weak solutions and spectral properties for Dirichlet and Neumann problems on bounded domains of $\mathbb{R}^n$ for linear second order degenerate elliptic partial differential operators with rough measurable coefficients of the form

$$(1.1) \quad X = -\operatorname{div}(P\nabla) + \mathbf{H}\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{S}'\mathbf{G} + \mathbf{F},$$

where $P = P(x)$ is a nonnegative definite symmetric measurable matrix function, $\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{F}$ are vector valued functions and $\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{S}$ are collections of first order subunit vector fields. We refer the reader to section 1.6 for a precise description of the constituents of X .

Before continuing we briefly describe how the paper is organized. Our results are developed in a general axiomatic framework similar to those used in [CRW, Section 3], [SW1, SW2], [MRW], that we outlined in Sections 1.1 through 1.6. This axiomatic setting includes the definition of geometric homogeneous space, of degenerate Sobolev spaces associated to a nonnegative definite symmetric measurable matrix function comparable to P and also gives Poincaré–Sobolev type inequalities. Existence of weak solutions and spectral properties associated to the Neumann problem for X (referred to as the X -Neumann problem) are studied in Section 2 and the main results are Theorems 2.11, 2.12, Corollary 2.17, and Theorem 2.20. We also mention that we develop a helpful example (see Example 2.21) in full detail for the reader's convenience. We give a spectral result for the Dirichlet problem for X (referred to as the X -Dirichlet problem) in Section 3, see Theorem 3.2, that complements the existence results of [R3]. Section 4 contains a maximum principle for weak solutions of $Xu \leq 0$ and in Section 5 we demonstrate a relationship between compact embeddings of Sobolev spaces and global Poincaré inequalities with gain; we refer the reader to Theorems 4.3 and 5.1 for these results. All of our results are developed in the spirit of [E] and [GT] using ideas presented in [CRW], [M1], [MP], [M2], [MRW], [R1], [R2], [R3], [SW1], [SW2], and other related works.

¹Università degli Studi di Milano, Italy. Partially supported by GNAMPA project with title “Equazioni differenziali con invarianze in analisi globale”, by GNAMPA section “Equazioni differenziali e sistemi dinamici” and by MIUR project “Metodi variazionali e topologici nello studio di fenomeni nonlineari”

²Cape Breton University, Sydney, NS Canada. Partially supported by The Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC) Discovery Grants program.

1.1. Geometric Homogeneous Spaces: Let Ω be a bounded open subset of $\mathbb{R}^n$ and ρ a symmetric quasi-metric defined in Ω . More precisely, $\rho : \Omega \times \Omega \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ and there is a $\kappa \geq 1$ so that for every $x, y, z \in \Omega$ each of the following are satisfied:

$$(1.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & \bullet \quad \rho(x, y) = 0 \iff x = y, \\ & \bullet \quad \rho(x, y) = \rho(y, x), \text{ and} \\ & \bullet \quad \rho(x, y) \leq \kappa[\rho(x, z) + \rho(z, y)]. \end{aligned}$$

Given $x \in \Omega$ and $r > 0$ we define the sets

$$\begin{aligned} B(x, r) &= \{y \in \Omega : \rho(x, y) < r\}, \text{ and} \\ D(x, r) &= \{y \in \Omega : |x - y| < r\}. \end{aligned}$$

We always refer to $B(x, r)$ as the quasimetric ball centered at x with radius r . $D(x, r)$ is the corresponding Euclidean ball with the same center and radius.

Definition 1.1. We say that the collection of quasimetric balls $\mathcal{B} = \{B(x, r)\}_{r>0; x \in \Omega}$ is *locally geometrically doubling* if given any compact $K \subset \Omega$ there is a $\delta = \delta(K) > 0$ so that for all $x \in K$ and $0 < r' \leq r < \delta$, the ρ -ball $B(x, r)$ may contain at most $C = C(r/r')$ disjoint ρ -balls of radius r' where C is independent of both x and K .

It is important to note that the notion of local geometric doubling is weaker than local doubling for Lebesgue measure on the collection of quasimetric balls centered in Ω . Recall that a measure μ is locally doubling for the collection $\mathcal{B}$ if given a compact set $K \subset \Omega$ there is a $\delta_1 = \delta_1(K)$ so that for any $x \in K$ and $0 < r < \delta_1$ we have $|B(x, 2r)|_\mu \leq C|B(x, r)|_\mu$ where $C > 0$ is independent of x, r, K . Helpful discussions on geometric doubling and doubling conditions are found in [HyK], and [HyM]. We now define the topological space on which we build our results.

Definition 1.2. The pair (Ω, ρ) is called a *geometric homogeneous space* if ρ is a symmetric quasimetric defined in Ω for which the three following properties hold.

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & \bullet \quad \text{For all } x \in \Omega \text{ and } r > 0 \text{ the quasimetric } \rho\text{-ball } B(x, r) \text{ is an open set} \\ & \quad \text{with respect to Euclidean topology.} \\ & \bullet \quad \text{For all } x, y \in \Omega, |x - y| \rightarrow 0 \text{ if } \rho(x, y) \rightarrow 0. \\ & \bullet \quad \text{The collection of } \rho\text{-balls } \mathcal{B} = \{B(x, r)\}_{x \in \Omega, r > 0} \text{ is locally} \\ & \quad \text{geometrically doubling.} \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1.3.

- (1) *The converse of (1.3) holds automatically since ρ -balls are open sets with respect to Euclidean topology.*
- (2) *In many situations it is convenient to work with ρ -balls that do not intersect the boundary of Ω and is the reasoning behind condition (1.3). To see this notice that (1.3) may be restated as: given $x \in \Omega$ and $\epsilon > 0$ there is a positive $\delta'' = \delta''(x, \epsilon)$ so that $B(x, \delta) \subset D(x, \epsilon)$. From this, given $x \in \Omega$ there is a $t_0 > 0$ so that $\overline{B(x, r)} \subset \Omega$ for all $0 < r < t_0$.*

1.2. Functional Spaces. Fix an open $\Theta \subset \Omega$, and a non-negative definite $n \times n$ measurable matrix $Q(x)$ with $|Q(x)| \in L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$. The degenerate Sobolev space $\mathcal{W}_Q^{1,2}(\Theta)$ is the collection of pairs $(f, \vec{g})$ obtained via isomorphism from the space $QH^1(\Theta)$ defined as the completion, with respect to the norm

$$(1.4) \quad \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} = \left(\int_\Theta |u|^2 dx + \int_\Theta |\sqrt{Q} \nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

of the collection

$$(1.5) \quad Lip_Q(\Theta) = \{\varphi \in Lip_{loc}(\Theta) : |\sqrt{Q}\nabla\varphi| \in L^2(\Theta)\}$$

of locally Lipschitz functions having finite $QH^1(\Theta)$ norm. In all of our developments we will denote the vector valued function $\vec{g}$ of the pair $(f, \vec{g}) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ by writing $\vec{g} = \nabla f$, and we will refer to it as the gradient part (or simply the gradient) of f . The canonical projection map $i : QH^1(\Theta) \rightarrow L^2(\Theta)$ defined by

$$i((f, \vec{g})) = f$$

is obviously continuous, but it need not be injective. It should be kept in mind at all times that $\vec{g}$ need not be uniquely determined by f ; see [FKS] for a well known example. In order to keep notation simple we will often abuse notation by writing $f \in QH^1(\Theta)$ in place of $(f, \nabla f) \in QH^1(\Theta)$. In cases where confusion may arise, specifically in Section 4, we will use bold faced characters when referring to elements of $QH^1(\Theta)$; i.e. we will write $\mathbf{f} \in QH^1(\Theta)$ in place of $f \in QH^1(\Theta)$.

The space $QH_0^1(\Theta)$ (respectively $\mathcal{W}_{Q,0}^{1,2}(\Theta)$) is obtained in a similar manner, but in this case we complete the set $Lip_0(\Theta)$, the set of those Lipschitz functions having compact support in Θ , with respect to the norm (1.4). Notice that all such functions have finite $QH^1(\Theta)$ norm as $|Q| \in L_{loc}^\infty(\Omega)$.

For clarity, we will always write $QH^1(\Theta)$ and $QH_0^1(\Theta)$ in place of $\mathcal{W}_Q^{1,2}(\Theta)$ and $\mathcal{W}_{Q,0}^{1,2}(\Theta)$ respectively, taking isomorphism in context. We adopted this notation in lieu of $W_Q^{1,2}(\Omega)$ and $W_{Q,0}^{1,2}(\Omega)$, as used in [SW1, SW2, CRW, MRW], in order to agree with classical literature, see for example [MS], where it is convention that “ W ” spaces refer to Sobolev spaces defined with respect to distributional derivatives. We also mention that it is possible to introduce definitions and make similar considerations for the spaces $QH^{1,p}(\Theta)$, $QH_0^{1,p}(\Theta)$ (or $W_Q^{1,p}(\Omega)$, $W_{Q,0}^{1,p}(\Omega)$ as in the above references) for $1 \leq p < \infty$, even in the case where $|Q(x)|$ is locally unbounded. We invite the interested reader to see [CRW], [MRW], [SW2] for the construction of these spaces and related objects.

1.3. Sobolev and Poincaré Inequalities. Essential to most of the arguments to follow are Poincaré – Sobolev type inequalities adapted to the matrix Q . We list these inequalities now noting that they are not assumed to hold at all times but, rather, called upon when necessary. To describe these efficiently, we fix a continuous function $r_1 : \Omega \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ to be used as a common radius restriction for quasimetric balls.

The Local Poincaré Inequality. We say that the local Poincaré inequality of order p holds if there are constants $C_2 > 0$ and $\mathbf{b} \geq 1$ so that for every ρ -ball $B(y, r)$ centered in Ω with $\mathbf{b}r \in (0, r_1(y))$ the inequality

$$(1.6) \quad \left(\frac{1}{|B_r|} \int_{B_r} |f - f_{B_r}|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq C_2 r \left(\frac{1}{|B_{\mathbf{b}r}|} \int_{B_{\mathbf{b}r}} |\sqrt{Q}\nabla f|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

holds for all $f \in Lip_{loc}(\Omega)$. Notice that a continuity argument allows one to extend (1.6) to hold for all pairs $(f, \nabla f) \in QH^{1,p}(\Omega)$.

The Global Sobolev Inequality. For an open set $\Theta \subset \Omega$ with $\overline{\Theta} \subset \Omega$, we say that the global Sobolev inequality holds on Θ holds if there are positive constants $C_3 > 0$ and $\sigma > 1$ such that

$$(1.7) \quad \left(\int_{\Theta} |f|^{2\sigma} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2\sigma}} \leq C_3 \left(\int_{\Theta} |\sqrt{Q}\nabla f|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

holds for all $f \in Lip_0(\Theta)$. Again, a continuity argument shows that (1.8) also holds for all $(w, \nabla w) \in QH_0^1(\Theta)$ if it holds for all $f \in Lip_0(\Theta)$.

Remark 1.4. *It is possible to replace (1.7) with a local version of the form*

$$(1.8) \quad \left(\int_{B(x,r)} |f|^{2\sigma} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2\sigma}} \leq C' \left(r^2 \int_{B(x,r)} |\sqrt{Q} \nabla f|^2 dx + \int_{B(x,r)} |f|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

holding for all $f \in Lip_0(B(x,r))$ and quasimetric balls $B(x,r)$ with $0 < r < r_1(x)$. In [R2], inequality (1.7) is proved for any open Θ such that $\overline{\Theta} \subset \Omega$ under the hypotheses given in subsections 1.1 and 1.2, provided Lebesgue measure is doubling for the collection of quasimetric balls $\mathcal{B}$ and both (1.6) with $p = 2$ and (1.8) hold. One may even replace the doubling assumption in [R2] with local geometric doubling; see [CRW, R2].

The Global Poincaré Inequality With Gain ω . For an open subset Θ of Ω satisfying $\overline{\Theta} \subset \Omega$ we say that the global Poincaré inequality with gain $\omega > 1$ holds on Θ if there are constants $C_4 > 0$ and $\omega > 1$ such that

$$(1.9) \quad \left(\int_{\Theta} |f - f_{\Theta}|^{2\omega} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2\omega}} \leq C_4 \left(\int_{\Theta} |\sqrt{Q} \nabla f|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

holds for all $f \in Lip_Q(\Theta)$.

Remark 1.5.

- (1) *If the global Poincaré inequality (1.9) holds, then Hölder's inequality implies that the **Global Weak Poincaré Inequality with gain $\omega > 1$:***

$$(1.10) \quad \left(\int_{\Theta} |f|^{2\omega} dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2\omega}} \leq C_4 \left(\int_{\Theta} |\sqrt{Q} \nabla f|^2 dx + \int_{\Theta} |f|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

also holds for all $f \in Lip_Q(\Theta)$.

- (2) *In the elliptic case ($Q(x) = Id$), inequalities of the form (1.9) and (1.10) are proved when the boundary of Θ is sufficiently regular. For example, $\partial\Theta \in C^{0,1}$ is used in [GT] for such purposes. See [GT, Theorem 7.26] and related discussions.*

There is a large body of literature discussing the inequalities just mentioned. We refer the reader to [E], [HK], and [J] for helpful discussions and examples.

As a last remark we mention that it is possible to obtain all the theory to follow if Lebesgue measure is replaced by any Radon measure μ that is absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue measure. The changes required for this are:

- replace $|E|$ with $|E|_{\mu}$ and any almost everywhere considerations shifted to μ -a.e.;
- Incorporate μ into the definition of Sobolev space by replacing $\|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}$ with

$$\|u\|_{QH_{\mu}^1(\Theta)} = \|u\|_{L_{\mu}^2(\Theta)} + \|\sqrt{Q} \nabla f\|_{L_{\mu}^2(\Theta)};$$

- replace dx with $d\mu$ in all integrals.

1.4. Compact Projections for Degenerate Sobolev Spaces. In our main results, it is essential that we are equipped with a compact mapping from $QH^1(\Theta)$ (respectively $QH_0^1(\Theta)$) into $L^2(\Theta)$ and this serves as our first application of the inequalities just listed. The following results are adapted from [CRW] and we refer the reader to that work for more general statements and weighted results.

Proposition 1.6 ([CRW] Corollary 3.25). *Let (Ω, ρ) be a geometric homogeneous space and fix an open set Θ satisfying $\overline{\Theta} \subset \Omega$. Suppose that the local Poincaré inequality (1.6) with $p = 2$ and*

the global Sobolev inequality (1.7) hold. Then the projection map $i : QH_0^1(\Theta) \rightarrow L^q(\Theta)$ defined by

$$(1.11) \quad i((u, \nabla u)) = u$$

is a compact mapping for all $q \in [1, 2\sigma)$.

Proposition 1.7 ([CRW] Theorem 3.14). *Let (Ω, ρ) be a geometric homogeneous space and fix an open set Θ satisfying $\overline{\Theta} \subset \Omega$. Suppose that the local Poincaré inequality (1.6) with $p = 2$ and the global weak Poincaré inequality (1.10) with gain $\omega > 1$ hold. Then the projection map $i : QH^1(\Theta) \rightarrow L^q(\Theta)$ defined by*

$$(1.12) \quad i((u, \nabla u)) = u$$

is a compact mapping for all $q \in [1, 2\omega)$.

1.5. Notation. Consider a vector field

$$W(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(x) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} = (w_1(x), \dots, w_n(x)) \cdot \nabla$$

If u is a real valued function on $\mathbb{R}^n$ and ν is a vector in $\mathbb{R}^n$ we adopt the notation

$$Wu = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \frac{\partial u}{\partial x_i}, \quad \langle \nu, W \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \nu_i,$$

where $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ denotes the standard inner product on $\mathbb{R}^n$. The formal adjoint $W'(x)$ of the vector field $W(x)$ is defined by

$$W'(x)u := -\operatorname{div}(w_1(x)u(x), \dots, w_n(x)u(x)) = -\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} (w_i(x)u(x)).$$

A vector field $W(x)$ as above is always identified with the vector valued function $(w_1(x), \dots, w_n(x))$ and is said to be *subunit* with respect to the matrix Q in Θ if

$$(1.13) \quad \left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i(x) \xi_i \right)^2 \leq \langle \xi, Q(x) \xi \rangle$$

for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and almost every $x \in \Theta$.

Remark 1.8. *If a vector field $W(x)$ is subunit with respect to the matrix $Q = Q(x)$ in Θ we will simply refer to it as a “subunit vector field” with the set Θ and matrix Q taken in context.*

Given $N \in \mathbb{N}$, an N -tuple $\mathbf{W} = (W_1, \dots, W_N)$ of vector fields and an $\mathbb{R}^N$ -valued function $\mathbf{G} = (g_1, \dots, g_N)$, $\mathbf{W}\mathbf{G}$ denotes the “inner product” of $\mathbf{W}$ and $\mathbf{G}$, i.e.

$$\mathbf{W}\mathbf{G} = \sum_{i=1}^N W_i(x) g_i(x).$$

Lastly, If u is a real valued function,

$$\mathbf{G}\mathbf{W}u = \sum_{i=1}^N g_i(x) W_i(x) u(x), \quad \mathbf{W}'(\mathbf{G}u) = \sum_{i=1}^N W_i'(x) (g_i(x) u(x)).$$

1.6. Second Order Linear Degenerate Elliptic Operators with Rough Coefficients.

Let Ω and $Q(x)$ be as in Chapter 1, Θ be a bounded domain with $\overline{\Theta} \subset \Omega$. We consider operators X defined by equations of the form

$$(1.14) \quad Xu = -\operatorname{div}(P\nabla u) + \mathbf{H}\mathbf{R}u + \mathbf{S}'(\mathbf{G}u) + Fu \text{ in } \Theta,$$

where $P = P(x)$ is a bounded measurable nonnegative definite symmetric $n \times n$ matrix defined in $\overline{\Theta}$ and comparable with $Q(x)$ in Θ . That is, there exist constants $c_1, C_1 > 0$ so that for every $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and almost every $x \in \Theta$ one has

$$(1.15) \quad c_1 \langle \xi, Q(x)\xi \rangle \leq \langle \xi, P(x)\xi \rangle \leq C_1 \langle \xi, Q(x)\xi \rangle.$$

$\mathbf{R}$, and $\mathbf{S}$ are, for some $N \in \mathbb{N}$, N -tuples of subunit vector fields with respect to the matrix $Q(x)$, see (1.13). $\mathbf{H}$ and $\mathbf{G}$ are $\mathbb{R}^N$ -valued measurable functions in Θ and F is a real-valued measurable function defined in Θ .

Remark 1.9. *The sign convention on the principal part of the operator X is as in [E] and [GT]. S. Rodney in [R1], [R2], and [R3] adopted the opposite convention.*

An operator X as above will always be referred to as a “second order linear degenerate elliptic operator with rough coefficients”. We will study existence and spectral properties of both Dirichlet and Neumann problems associated to X in the context of two “negativity” conditions that we now introduce.

Definition 1.10. We say that a second order linear degenerate elliptic operator with rough coefficients X satisfies **negativity condition (1)** if and only if either

- i) there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every $(u, \nabla u), (v, \nabla v) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ satisfying $uv \geq 0$ almost everywhere in Θ one has

$$\int_{\Theta} Fuv + \mathbf{G}\mathbf{S}(uv) dx \geq \varepsilon \int_{\Theta} uv dx$$

or

- ii) for every $(u, \nabla u), (v, \nabla v) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ satisfying $uv \geq 0$ almost everywhere in Θ one has

$$\int_{\Theta} Fuv + \mathbf{H}\mathbf{R}(uv) dx \geq \varepsilon \int_{\Theta} uv dx.$$

Definition 1.11. We say that X satisfies **negativity condition (2)** if and only if either

- i) for every $(u, \nabla u), (v, \nabla v) \in QH_0^1(\Theta)$ such that $uv \geq 0$ almost everywhere in Θ one has

$$\int_{\Theta} Fuv + \mathbf{G}\mathbf{S}(uv) dx \geq 0$$

or

- ii) for every $(u, \nabla u), (v, \nabla v) \in QH_0^1(\Theta)$ such that $uv \geq 0$ almost everywhere in Θ one has

$$\int_{\Theta} Fuv + \mathbf{H}\mathbf{R}(uv) dx \geq 0.$$

It is useful to note that if X satisfies negativity condition (2), part i), then the operator X is a member of the “Nonnegative Class” as described in [R3].

2. EXISTENCE AND SPECTRAL RESULTS FOR THE X -NEUMANN PROBLEM

The presentation of the results in this section follows in part the presentation of the analogous results for second order elliptic Dirichlet problems on bounded domains of $\mathbb{R}^n$ as given in [E]. Furthermore, many of the arguments used, vis-a-vis existence of weak solutions, follow similar paths as those found in [R3].

Let Ω and $Q = Q(x)$ be as in sections 1.1 and 1.2 respectively. We begin by describing the action of a subunit vector field on elements and products of elements of $QH^1(\Theta)$.

Lemma 2.1. *Let Θ be a bounded open set such that $\overline{\Theta} \subset \Omega$, let $(u, \nabla u), (v, \nabla v) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ and let $W(x) = (w_1(x), \dots, w_n(x))$ be a subunit vector field in Θ . Assume that the global weak Poincaré inequality with gain $\omega > 1$ holds, see (1.10). Then:*

- 1) Wu is defined as an element of $L^2(\Theta)$, with $\|Wu\|_{L^2(\Theta)} \leq \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}$, and

$$W(x)\varphi(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(x) \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i}(x)$$

for every locally Lipschitz function φ defined on Θ having finite $QH^1(\Theta)$ norm.

- 2) $W(uv)$ is defined as an element of $L^{\frac{2\omega}{\omega+1}}(\Theta)$, with

$$\|W(uv)\|_{L^{\frac{2\omega}{\omega+1}}(\Theta)} \leq 2C_4 \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} \|v\|_{QH^1(\Theta)},$$

with $C_4 > 0$ as in (1.10), and with $W(uv) = uWv + vWu$ as elements of $L^{\frac{2\omega}{\omega+1}}(\Theta)$.

Proof: The proof of Lemma 2.1 follows from the same arguments used in [R3, Lemma 3.15]. Here, one simply uses the global weak Poincaré inequality (1.10) with gain $\omega > 1$ in place of a global Sobolev inequality as used in [R3] (see condition [R3, (2.11)] or, equivalently, (1.7)). $\square$

Definition 2.2. Given a second order linear degenerate elliptic operator with rough coefficients X as in (1.14), we introduce the associated bilinear form acting on $QH^1(\Theta) \times QH^1(\Theta)$,

$$(2.1) \quad \mathcal{L}(u, v) = \int_{\Theta} \left[\langle \nabla v, P(x) \nabla u \rangle + v \mathbf{H} R u + u \mathbf{G} S v + F u v \right] dx.$$

As was done in [R3] for the X -Dirichlet problem, the bilinear form (2.1) will be used in a moment to define a notion of weak solution for the X -Neumann problem. To begin the study of such objects, we show the boundedness of $\mathcal{L}$ on $QH^1(\Theta)$ followed by an almost-coercive estimate.

Proposition 2.3. *Let Θ be a bounded domain with $\overline{\Theta} \subset \Omega$ and assume that the global weak Poincaré inequality (1.10) with gain $\omega > 1$ holds. Assume that $F \in L^t(\Theta)$ with $t \geq \omega' = \frac{\omega}{\omega-1}$ and that $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H} \in [L^q(\Theta)]^N$ with $q \geq 2\omega'$. Then there exists a constant $C_6 = C_6(C_1, C_4, N, \|F\|_{L^{\omega'}(\Theta)}, \|\mathbf{G}\|_{L^{2\omega'}(\Theta)} + \|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^{2\omega'}(\Theta)}) > 0$ such that*

$$(2.2) \quad |\mathcal{L}(u, v)| \leq C_6 \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} \|v\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}$$

for every $u, v \in QH^1(\Theta)$.

Corollary 2.4. *Under the hypotheses of Proposition 2.3, the bilinear form $\mathcal{L}(\cdot, \cdot)$ introduced in Definition 2.2 is well defined and continuous on $QH^1(\Theta) \times QH^1(\Theta)$.*

Proof of Proposition 2.3: Let $u, v \in QH^1(\Theta)$. Then, by (1.15) and Schwarz's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla v, P(x) \nabla u \rangle dx \right| &\leq \int_{\Theta} |\sqrt{P(x)} \nabla u| |\sqrt{P(x)} \nabla v| dx \\ &\leq \left(\int_{\Theta} |\sqrt{P(x)} \nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_{\Theta} |\sqrt{P(x)} \nabla v|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq C_1^2 \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} \|v\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Using a generalization of Hölder's inequality (see [GT, (7.11)] with exponents 2ω , $2\omega'$, and 2) together with the results of Lemma 2.1 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Theta} v \mathbf{H} \mathbf{R} u dx \right| &\leq \|v\|_{L^{2\omega}(\Theta)} \|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^{2\omega'}(\Theta)} \|\mathbf{R} u\|_{L^2(\Theta)} \\ &\leq C_4 \sqrt{N} \|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^{2\omega'}(\Theta)} \|v\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\left| \int_{\Theta} u \mathbf{G} \mathbf{S} v dx \right| \leq C_4 \sqrt{N} \|\mathbf{G}\|_{L^{2\omega'}(\Theta)} \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} \|v\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}.$$

Another application of [GT, (7.11)] with exponents ω' , 2ω , and 2ω gives us

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Theta} F u v dx \right| &\leq \|F\|_{L^{\omega'}(\Theta)} \|u\|_{L^{2\omega}(\Theta)} \|v\|_{L^{2\omega}(\Theta)} \\ &\leq C_4^2 \|F\|_{L^{\omega'}(\Theta)} \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} \|v\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, (2.2) holds with

$$C_6 = C_1^2 + C_4 \sqrt{N} (\|\mathbf{G}\|_{L^{2\omega'}(\Theta)} + \|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^{2\omega'}(\Theta)}) + C_4^2 \|F\|_{L^{\omega'}(\Theta)}.$$

□

Proposition 2.5. *Let Θ be a bounded domain such that $\overline{\Theta} \subset \Omega$ and assume that the global weak Poincaré inequality (1.10) with gain $\omega > 1$ holds. Assume that $F \in L^t(\Theta)$ with $t > \omega'$ and that $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H} \in [L^q(\Theta)]^N$ with $q > 2\omega'$. Then, there exists a constant $C_7 = C_7(c_1, C_4, \omega, N, t, q, \|F\|_{L^t(\Theta)}, \|\mathbf{G}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} + \|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^q(\Theta)}) > 0$ so that*

$$(2.3) \quad |\mathcal{L}(u, u)| \geq \frac{c_1}{4} \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}^2 - C_7 \|u\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2$$

for every $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$.

Proof of Proposition 2.5: Let $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$. Then, (1.15) gives

$$(2.4) \quad \mathcal{L}(u, u) \geq c_1 \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla u, Q(x) \nabla u \rangle dx - \int_{\Theta} |u(\mathbf{H} \mathbf{R} u + \mathbf{G} \mathbf{S} u)| dx - \int_{\Theta} |F| u^2 dx.$$

Using Hölder's inequality with exponents $t, t' \geq 1$ we have

$$\int_{\Theta} |F| u^2 dx \leq \|F\|_{L^t(\Theta)} \|u\|_{L^{2t'}(\Theta)}^2 \leq (\varepsilon \|u\|_{L^{2\omega}(\Theta)}^2 + \varepsilon^{-\frac{2\omega}{t(\omega-1)-\omega}} \|u\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2) \|F\|_{L^t(\Theta)},$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$; we used the interpolation inequality [GT, (7.10)]. Now, if $\|F\|_{L^t(\Theta)} = 0$ then $\int_{\Theta} |F| u^2 dx = 0$, otherwise we choose $\varepsilon = \frac{c_1}{8\|F\|_{L^t(\Theta)} C_4^2}$ so that (1.10) gives

$$(2.5) \quad \int_{\Theta} |F| u^2 dx \leq \alpha \|u\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 + \frac{c_1}{8} \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}^2,$$

with $\alpha = \alpha(c_1, C_4, t, \omega, \|F\|_{L^t(\Theta)}) > 0$.

In a similar way, we use Lemma 2.1 and [GT, (7.11)] to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Theta} |u(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{R}u + \mathbf{G}\mathbf{S}u)| dx \\
& \leq \|u\|_{L^{\frac{2q}{q-2}}(\Theta)} (\|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} \|\mathbf{R}u\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \|\mathbf{G}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} \|\mathbf{S}u\|_{L^2(\Theta)}) \\
& \leq \sqrt{N} (\|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} + \|\mathbf{G}\|_{L^q(\Theta)}) \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} \|u\|_{L^{\frac{2q}{q-2}}(\Theta)} \\
& \leq \sqrt{N} (\|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} + \|\mathbf{G}\|_{L^q(\Theta)}) \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} (\varepsilon \|u\|_{L^{2\omega}(\Theta)} + \varepsilon^{-\frac{2\omega}{(q-2)\omega-q}} \|u\|_{L^2(\Theta)}),
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\varepsilon > 0$; we again used [GT, (7.10)]. We now use Young's inequality to show that for any $\delta > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Theta} |u(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{R}u + \mathbf{G}\mathbf{S}u)| dx \\
& \leq \varepsilon \sqrt{N} (\|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} + \|\mathbf{G}\|_{L^q(\Theta)}) \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} \|u\|_{L^{2\omega}(\Theta)} \\
& \quad + \varepsilon^{-\frac{2\omega}{(q-2)\omega-q}} \sqrt{N} (\|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} + \|\mathbf{G}\|_{L^q(\Theta)}) \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} \|u\|_{L^2(\Theta)} \\
& \leq \varepsilon \sqrt{N} (\|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} + \|\mathbf{G}\|_{L^q(\Theta)}) \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} \|u\|_{L^{2\omega}(\Theta)} \\
& \quad + \varepsilon^{-\frac{2\omega}{(q-2)\omega-q}} \sqrt{N} (\|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} + \|\mathbf{G}\|_{L^q(\Theta)}) \left(\frac{\delta}{2} \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}^2 + \frac{1}{2\delta} \|u\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 \right).
\end{aligned}$$

If $\|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} + \|\mathbf{G}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} = 0$ then $\int_{\Theta} |u(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{R}u + \mathbf{G}\mathbf{S}u)| dx = 0$, otherwise we choose

$$\varepsilon = \frac{c_1}{8\sqrt{N}C_4(\|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} + \|\mathbf{G}\|_{L^q(\Theta)})}, \quad \delta = \frac{\varepsilon^{\frac{2\omega}{(q-2)\omega-q}} c_1}{\sqrt{N}(\|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} + \|\mathbf{G}\|_{L^q(\Theta)})}$$

so that (1.10) gives

$$(2.6) \quad \int_{\Theta} |u(\mathbf{H}\mathbf{R}u + \mathbf{G}\mathbf{S}u)| dx \leq \frac{5c_1}{8} \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}^2 + \beta \|u\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2,$$

where $\beta = \beta(c_1, C_4, N, q, \omega, \|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} + \|\mathbf{G}\|_{L^q(\Theta)}) > 0$. Inserting (2.5) and (2.6) into (2.4) we have

$$\mathcal{L}(u, u) \geq \frac{c_1}{4} \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}^2 - (c_1 + \alpha + \beta) \|u\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2,$$

which is (2.4) with $C_7 = c_1 + \alpha + \beta > 0$. □

With the boundedness and almost-coercivity of the bilinear form $\mathcal{L}$ concluded, we now formally define the notion of weak solution associated to the X -Neumann problem.

Definition 2.6. Let X be a second order linear degenerate elliptic operator with rough coefficients as in (1.14). Assume that $\partial\Theta$ is piecewise C^1 and let ν be the unit outward normal vector at each sufficiently regular boundary point. Assume that the global weak Poincaré inequality (1.10) with gain $\omega > 1$ holds, let $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H} \in [L^q(\Theta)]^N$ with $q \geq 2\omega'$ and let $F \in L^t(\Theta)$ with $t \geq \omega'$. If $f \in L^2(\Theta)$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{T}$ is a K -tuple of subunit vector fields and $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$, then a function $(u, \nabla u) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ is a weak solution of the X -Neumann Problem

$$(2.7) \quad \begin{cases} Xu = f + \mathbf{T}'\mathbf{g} & \text{in } \Theta \\ \langle \nu, P(x)\nabla u + u\mathbf{G}\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{g}\mathbf{T} \rangle = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta \end{cases}$$

if and only if

$$(2.8) \quad \mathcal{L}(u, v) = \int_{\Theta} f v + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{T} v dx \quad \text{for every } v \in QH^1(\Theta).$$

Motivation. Assume that $\partial\Theta$ is smooth and that the coefficients of the operator X are $C^1(\bar{\Theta})$. If $u \in C^2(\bar{\Theta})$ and $v \in C^1(\bar{\Theta})$, it's easy to see using the Divergence Theorem that

$$\int_{\Theta} v Xu \, dx = \mathcal{L}(u, v) - \int_{\partial\Theta} v \langle \nu, P(x) \nabla u + u \mathbf{GS} \rangle \, d\sigma,$$

while

$$\int_{\Theta} (f + \mathbf{T}'\mathbf{g})v = \int_{\Theta} fv + \mathbf{gT}v - \int_{\partial\Theta} v \langle \nu, \mathbf{gT} \rangle \, d\sigma.$$

Thus u is a classical solution of problem (2.7) if and only if it satisfies (2.8). Notice that if $\mathbf{G}$ and $\mathbf{g}$ are identically null and if $P(x)$ is strictly positive definite and continuous on $\bar{\Theta}$, we recover the usual definition of weak solution of the Neumann Problem related to the (now elliptic) differential operator X .

We now come to the first of our existence results - the existence of weak solutions to a modified version of the X -Neumann problem in Θ . The theorem is a consequence of Propositions (2.3) and (2.5) with an application of the Lax-Milgram lemma.

Theorem 2.7. *Let Θ be a bounded domain such that $\bar{\Theta} \subset \Omega$ and assume that the global weak Poincaré inequality (1.10) with gain $\omega > 1$ holds. Let X be a second order linear degenerate elliptic operator with rough coefficients as in (1.14). Assume that $F \in L^t(\Theta)$ with $t > \omega'$ and that $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H} \in [L^q(\Theta)]^N$ with $q > 2\omega'$. Then there is a constant $\gamma > 0$ so that given any $\mu \geq \gamma$, $f \in L^2(\Theta)$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, any K -tuple $\mathbf{T}$ of subunit vector fields and $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$ there exists a unique weak solution $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ of the X -Neumann Problem*

$$(2.9) \quad \begin{cases} Xu + \mu u = f + \mathbf{T}'\mathbf{g} & \text{in } \Theta \\ \langle \nu, P(x) \nabla u + u \mathbf{GS} - \mathbf{gT} \rangle = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, if $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ is a weak solution of (2.9) then

$$(2.10) \quad \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} \leq \frac{4}{c_1} (\|f\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \sqrt{K} \|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(\Theta)}).$$

Proof of Theorem 2.7: By Proposition 2.5 there is a $\gamma > 0$ such that for every $\mu \geq \gamma$ one has

$$(2.11) \quad \mathcal{L}(u, u) + \mu \|u\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 \geq \mathcal{L}(u, u) + \gamma \|u\|_{L^2(\Theta)}^2 \geq \frac{c_1}{4} \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}^2$$

for every $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$. Using Proposition 2.3, one also sees that for each $\mu \geq \gamma$

$$\left| \mathcal{L}(u, v) + \mu \int_{\Theta} uv \, dx \right| \leq (C_6 + \mu) \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} \|v\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}$$

for every $u, v \in QH^1(\Theta)$. It follows that, for every $\mu \geq \gamma$, the bilinear form $\mathcal{L}_\mu$ defined on $QH^1(\Theta) \times QH^1(\Theta)$ by setting

$$\mathcal{L}_\mu(u, v) = \mathcal{L}(u, v) + \mu \int_{\Theta} uv \, dx \quad \text{for every } u, v \in QH^1(\Theta)$$

is both bounded and coercive. Next, we notice that Lemma 2.1 implies that the map ϕ defined by

$$\phi(v) = \int_{\Theta} fv + \mathbf{gT}v \, dx \quad \text{for every } v \in QH^1(\Theta)$$

is linear and continuous. Indeed,

$$(2.12) \quad \left| \int_{\Theta} f v + \mathbf{g} \mathbf{T} v \, dx \right| \leq \|f\|_{L^2(\Theta)} \|v\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(\Theta)} \|\mathbf{T} v\|_{L^2(\Theta)} \\ \leq (\|f\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \sqrt{K} \|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(\Theta)}) \|v\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}$$

for every $v \in QH^1(\Theta)$. Applying the Lax–Milgram lemma we conclude that there exists a unique $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ satisfying

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mu}(u, v) = \phi(v)$$

for every $v \in QH^1(\Theta)$. Recalling Definition 2.6, we see that u is the unique weak solution in $QH^1(\Theta)$ of the X -Neumann problem (2.9). Moreover, (2.11) and (2.12) indicate that such a u also satisfies

$$(2.13) \quad \frac{c_1}{4} \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} \leq (\|f\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \sqrt{K} \|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(\Theta)})$$

and inequality (2.10) follows. $\square$

Remark 2.8. Notice that the same arguments used in the proof of Theorem 2.7 show that for every $\mu \geq \gamma$ and every $\phi \in (QH^1(\Theta))^* \cong QH^1(\Theta)$, the dual space to $QH^1(\Theta)$, there exists a unique $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ such that

$$(2.14) \quad \mathcal{L}_{\mu}(u, v) = \mathcal{L}(u, v) + \mu \int_{\Theta} uv \, dx = \phi(v) \quad \text{for every } v \in QH^1(\Theta).$$

Moreover, the solution map $S_{\mu} : (QH^1(\Theta))^* \rightarrow QH^1(\Theta)$, defined by setting $S_{\mu}(\phi) = u$ if and only if $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ satisfies (2.14), is linear and continuous, with

$$\|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} \leq \frac{4}{c_1} \|\phi\|_{(QH^1(\Theta))^*}.$$

Definition 2.9. Let X be a second order linear degenerate elliptic operator with rough coefficients as in (1.14). Assume that $\partial\Theta$ is piecewise C^1 and let ν be the outward unit normal to $\partial\Theta$ at each sufficiently regular boundary point. Assume that the global weak Poincaré inequality (1.10) with gain $\omega > 1$ holds, let $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H} \in [L^q(\Theta)]^N$ with $q \geq 2\omega'$ and let $F \in L^t(\Theta)$ with $t \geq \omega'$. If $f \in L^2(\Theta)$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{T}$ is a K -tuple of subunit vector fields and $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$, then the adjoint problem to the X -Neumann Problem (2.7) is given by

$$(2.15) \quad \begin{cases} X^* u := -\operatorname{div}(P(x)\nabla u) + \mathbf{G} \mathbf{S} u + \mathbf{R}'(\mathbf{H} u) + F u = f + \mathbf{T}' \mathbf{g} & \text{in } \Theta \\ \langle \nu, P(x)\nabla u + u \mathbf{H} \mathbf{R} - \mathbf{g} \mathbf{T} \rangle = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta. \end{cases}$$

We will say that the X -Neumann Problem (2.7) is *self-adjoint* if $\mathbf{H} \mathbf{R} \equiv \mathbf{G} \mathbf{S}$ on Θ , i.e. if

$$\int_{\Theta} v \mathbf{H} \mathbf{R} u \, dx = \int_{\Theta} v \mathbf{G} \mathbf{S} u \, dx \quad \text{for every } u, v \in QH^1(\Theta).$$

Remark 2.10. The bilinear form $\mathcal{L}^* : QH^1(\Theta) \times QH^1(\Theta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ associated to the adjoint problem (2.15) is

$$(2.16) \quad \mathcal{L}^*(u, v) = \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla v, P(x)\nabla u \rangle + v \mathbf{G} \mathbf{S} u + u \mathbf{H} \mathbf{R} v + F u v \, dx = \mathcal{L}(v, u),$$

for every $u, v \in QH^1(\Theta)$.

We now present our main existence result for the X -Neumann problem.

Theorem 2.11. *Let (Ω, ρ) be a geometric homogeneous space and Θ be a bounded domain with $\overline{\Theta} \subset \Omega$. Assume that the local Poincaré inequality (1.6) holds with $p = 2$ and that the global weak Poincaré inequality (1.10) with gain $\omega > 1$ holds. Let X be a second order linear degenerate elliptic operator with rough coefficients as in (1.14). Assume that $F \in L^t(\Theta)$ with $t > \omega'$ and that $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H} \in [L^q(\Theta)]^N$ with $q > 2\omega'$. Then, we have the following conclusions.*

1) *One and only one of the following alternatives hold:*

either

(I) *given any $f \in L^2(\Theta)$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, any K -tuple of subunit vector fields $\mathbf{T}$, and $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$ there exists a unique weak solution $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ of the X -Neumann Problem (2.7)*

or

(II) *there exist nontrivial weak solutions $u \in QH^1(\Theta) \setminus \{(0, \mathbf{0})\}$ of the homogeneous X -Neumann Problem*

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{cases} Xu = 0 & \text{in } \Theta \\ \langle \nu, P(x)\nabla u + u\mathbf{GS} \rangle = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta. \end{cases}$$

2) *If alternative 1)-(II) holds, then the dimension of the subspace $N \subset QH^1(\Theta)$ of weak solutions of the homogeneous X -Neumann Problem (2.17) is finite and equals the dimension of the subspace $N^* \subset QH^1(\Theta)$ of weak solutions of the adjoint homogeneous X -Neumann Problem*

$$(2.18) \quad \begin{cases} X^*w = 0 & \text{in } \Theta \\ \langle \nu, P(x)\nabla w + w\mathbf{HR} \rangle = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta. \end{cases}$$

3) *If alternative 1)-(II) holds, the X -Neumann Problem (2.7) admits a weak solution $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ for given $f \in L^2(\Theta)$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{T}$ a K -tuple of subunit vector fields and $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$ if and only if*

$$\int_{\Theta} fw + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{T}w \, dx = 0$$

for every $w \in N^*$.

Proof of Theorem 2.11: To begin, we notice that Theorem 2.7 and Remark 2.10 provide a $\gamma > 0$ so that for every $\mu \geq \gamma$ and every $\phi \in (QH^1(\Theta))^*$, there exist unique $v, w \in QH^1(\Theta)$ so that

$$\mathcal{L}(v, \psi) + \mu \int_{\Theta} v\psi \, dx = \phi(\psi), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}^*(w, \psi) + \mu \int_{\Theta} w\psi \, dx = \phi(\psi)$$

for every $\psi \in QH^1(\Theta)$. The corresponding solution maps

$$S_{\mu}, S_{\mu}^* : (QH^1(\Theta))^* \rightarrow QH^1(\Theta)$$

defined by setting $S_{\mu}\phi = v$ and $S_{\mu}^*\phi = w$ are well defined, linear and continuous. Next, we introduce the map $J : QH^1(\Theta) \rightarrow (QH^1(\Theta))^*$ defined by setting

$$Ju(v) = \int_{\Theta} uv \, dx$$

for every $u, v \in QH^1(\Theta)$. The map J is linear, continuous and, by Proposition 1.7 with $q = 2$, compact.

Now, given $f \in L^2(\Theta)$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{T}$ a K -tuple of subunit vector fields and $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$ we define a continuous linear functional φ on $QH^1(\Theta)$:

$$(2.19) \quad \varphi(\psi) = \int_{\Theta} f\psi + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{T}\psi \, dx.$$

Notice that $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ is a weak solution of the X -Neumann Problem (2.7) if and only if

$$\begin{cases} Xu + \gamma u = \gamma u + f + \mathbf{T}'\mathbf{g} & \text{in } \Theta \\ \langle \nu, P(x)\nabla u + u\mathbf{G}\mathbf{S} - \mathbf{g}\mathbf{T} \rangle = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta; \end{cases}$$

that is, if and only if one has

$$\mathcal{L}(u, \psi) + \gamma \int_{\Theta} u\psi \, dx = \varphi(\psi) + \gamma Ju(\psi)$$

for every $\psi \in QH^1(\Theta)$. This is equivalent to requiring that $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ solves

$$(2.20) \quad u - \mathcal{K}u = \Phi$$

with $\Phi = S_{\gamma}\varphi \in QH^1(\Theta)$ where $\mathcal{K} = \gamma S_{\gamma} \circ J : QH^1(\Theta) \rightarrow QH^1(\Theta)$; a compact linear operator. Similarly we see that $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ solves the homogeneous X -Neumann Problem (2.17) if and only if it is a solution of

$$u - \mathcal{K}u = 0.$$

Hence, we can apply the Fredholm Alternative, see for instance [E, theorem 5 (appendix D)], and conclude that either

(A) for every $\Phi \in QH^1(\Theta)$ equation (2.20) admits a unique solution $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$,

or

(B) the homogeneous equation associated to (2.20) admits nontrivial solutions $u \in QH^1(\Theta) \setminus \{(0, \mathbf{0})\}$.

If alternative (A) holds, then clearly the X -Neumann Problem (2.7) admits a unique weak solution in $QH^1(\Theta)$ for any choice of $f \in L^2(\Theta)$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{T}$ a K -tuple of subunit vector fields and $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$; this proves 1)–(I). On the other hand, if alternative (B) holds, the Fredholm Alternative states that there are nontrivial solutions $u \in QH^1(\Theta) \setminus \{(0, \mathbf{0})\}$ of the homogeneous equation $u - \mathcal{K}u = 0$. This proves 1)–(II) and completes the proof of 1).

Assume now that alternative (B) holds, i.e. that 1)–(II) of the statement of the Theorem holds. Let $\mathcal{K}^* : (QH^1(\Theta))^* \rightarrow (QH^1(\Theta))^*$ be the adjoint operator to $\mathcal{K}$ and let $V^* \subset (QH^1(\Theta))^*$ be the subspace of weak solutions of

$$(2.21) \quad \Psi - \mathcal{K}^*\Psi = 0.$$

Then, by the Fredholm Alternative we obtain

$$1 \leq \dim N = \dim V^* < \infty.$$

By the properties of adjoint operators one has

$$\mathcal{K}^* = \gamma J^* \circ (S_{\gamma})^*,$$

where J^* , $(S_{\gamma})^*$ are the adjoint operators of J and S_{γ} respectively. Since $QH^1(\Theta)$ is reflexive and $\mathcal{L}(u, v) = \mathcal{L}^*(v, u)$ for every $u, v \in QH^1(\Theta)$, it is evident that $J^* \equiv J$ and $(S_{\gamma})^* \equiv S_{\gamma}^*$. Therefore, we have that $\Psi \in (QH^1(\Theta))^*$ is a solution of equation (2.21) if and only if

$$\Psi = \mathcal{K}^*\Psi = \gamma J(S_{\gamma}^*\Psi).$$

Setting $w = S_{\gamma}^*\Psi \in QH^1(\Theta)$ and recalling the definitions of the mappings J and S_{γ}^* , we obtain

$$\Psi(v) = \gamma \int_{\Theta} vw \, dx \quad \text{for every } v \in QH^1(\Theta),$$

where w is a weak solution of the adjoint homogeneous X -Neumann Problem (2.18). This implies that $V^* = JN^*$, so that

$$\dim V^* \leq \dim N^*$$

as the map J may fail to be injective (we recall that the map $i : QH^1(\Theta) \rightarrow L^2(\Theta)$ of Proposition (1.7) may not be injective). We now conclude that

$$\dim N \leq \dim N^*.$$

If we repeat the above argument, replacing the operator X with X^* and the bilinear form $\mathcal{L}(\cdot, \cdot)$ with $\mathcal{L}^*(\cdot, \cdot)$, we arrive at the opposite inequality: $\dim N \geq \dim N^*$. Part 2) of the theorem had now been proven.

Suppose again that alternative (B) holds. That is, assume that item 1)–(II) holds. By the previous arguments, $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ is a weak solution of the X -Neumann Problem (2.7) if and only if it is a solution of equation (2.20), with $\Phi = S_\gamma \varphi \in QH^1(\Theta)$ and where $\varphi \in (QH^1(\Theta))^*$ is defined by (2.19). The Fredholm Alternative indicates that such an equation admits a solution if and only if $\Psi(\Phi) = 0$ for every $\Psi \in V^* = JN^*$. That is, if and only if

$$\int_{\Theta} \Phi w \, dx = 0$$

for every weak solution $w \in QH^1(\Theta)$ of the homogeneous adjoint X -Neumann Problem (2.18). Notice that such w satisfy

$$\int_{\Theta} fw + \mathbf{gT}w \, dx = \varphi(w) = \mathcal{L}_\gamma(\Phi, w) = \mathcal{L}^*(w, \Phi) + \gamma \int_{\Theta} \Phi w \, dx = \gamma \int_{\Theta} \Phi w \, dx.$$

Thus, problem (2.7) admits a weak solution $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ if and only if

$$\int_{\Theta} fw + \mathbf{gT}w \, dx = 0$$

for every $w \in N^*$. This completes the proof of part 3). □

With Theorem 2.11 in hand we now begin our analysis of spectral properties associated to the X -Neumann problem.

Theorem 2.12. *Let (Ω, ρ) be a geometric homogeneous space and let Θ be a bounded domain with $\bar{\Theta} \subset \Omega$. Assume that both the local Poincaré inequality (1.6) with $p = 2$ and the global weak Poincaré inequality (1.10) with gain $\omega > 1$ hold. Let X be a second order linear degenerate elliptic operator with rough coefficients as in (1.14). Assume that $F \in L^t(\Theta)$ with $t > \omega'$ and that $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H} \in [L^q(\Theta)]^N$ with $q > 2\omega'$. Then there exists an at most countable set $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}$ so that the problem*

$$(2.22) \quad \begin{cases} Xu = \lambda u + f + \mathbf{T}'\mathbf{g} & \text{in } \Theta \\ \langle \nu, P(x)\nabla u + u\mathbf{GS} - \mathbf{gT} \rangle = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta \end{cases}$$

has a unique weak solution $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ for every $f \in L^2(\Theta)$, every $K \in \mathbb{N}$, every K -tuple $\mathbf{T}$ of subunit vector fields and every $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$ if and only if $\lambda \notin \Sigma$. Moreover, if Σ is infinite, its elements can be arranged in a monotone sequence that diverges to $+\infty$.

Definition 2.13. With Σ as in Theorem 2.12, we will call any $\lambda \in \Sigma$ an eigenvalue of the X -Neumann Problem (2.22). Any weak solution $u \in QH^1(\Theta) \setminus \{(0, \mathbf{0})\}$ of the Homogeneous X -Neumann Problem

$$(2.23) \quad \begin{cases} Xu = \lambda u & \text{in } \Theta \\ \langle \nu, P(x)\nabla u + u\mathbf{GS} \rangle = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta \end{cases}$$

will be called an eigenfunction of the X -Neumann Problem (2.22) associated to the eigenvalue λ .

Proof of Theorem 2.12: By Theorem 2.7 there exists a $\gamma > 0$ such that for every $\mu \geq \gamma$, every $f \in L^2(\Theta)$, every $K \in \mathbb{N}$, every K -tuple $\mathbf{T}$ of subunit vector fields and every $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$ there exists a unique weak solution to problem (2.9). Thus, problem (2.22) admits a unique weak solution whenever $\lambda \leq -\gamma$.

From now on we will assume that $\lambda > -\gamma$, with $\gamma > 0$. Arguing as in the proof of Theorem 2.11 we see that problem (2.22) admits a unique weak solution for every $f \in L^2(\Theta)$, every $K \in \mathbb{N}$, every K -tuple $\mathbf{T}$ of subunit vector fields and every $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$ if and only if $(u, \nabla u) = (0, \mathbf{0})$ is the unique weak solution of (2.23). Moreover, if problem (2.23) admits nontrivial weak solutions, then the subspace generated by those weak solutions has finite dimension.

Now, $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ is a weak solution of (2.23) if and only if it is a weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} Xu + \gamma u = (\lambda + \gamma)u & \text{in } \Theta \\ \langle \nu, P(x)\nabla u + u\mathbf{GS} - \mathbf{gT} \rangle = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta, \end{cases}$$

and this in turn holds if and only if

$$u = S_\gamma \circ J((\gamma + \lambda)u) = \frac{\gamma + \lambda}{\gamma} \mathcal{K}u,$$

where $\mathcal{K} = \gamma S_\gamma \circ J : QH^1(\Theta) \rightarrow QH^1(\Theta)$ is the linear, compact operator defined in the proof of Theorem 2.11. Thus, $u \in QH^1(\Theta) \setminus \{(0, \mathbf{0})\}$ is a weak solution of problem (2.23) if and only if it is an eigenfunction of the compact linear operator $\mathcal{K}$ associated to the eigenvalue $\frac{\gamma}{\lambda + \gamma}$.

The set Σ' of real eigenvalues of $\mathcal{K}$ is countable at most and, if it is infinite, its elements can be arranged as a sequence converging to 0. Consequently, the set $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}$ of numbers λ such that problem (2.23) has nontrivial weak solutions in $QH^1(\Theta) \setminus \{(0, \mathbf{0})\}$ is countable at most and, if infinite, it comprises the values of a monotone sequence diverging to $+\infty$.

□

Theorem 2.14. *Let (Ω, ρ) be a geometric homogeneous space and let Θ be a bounded domain with $\overline{\Theta} \subset \Omega$. Assume that both the local Poincaré inequality (1.6) with $p = 2$ and the global weak Poincaré inequality (1.10) with gain $\omega > 1$ hold. Let X be a second order linear degenerate elliptic operator with rough coefficients as in (1.14). Assume that $F \in L^t(\Theta)$ with $t > \omega'$ and that $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H} \in [L^q(\Theta)]^N$ with $q > 2\omega'$. If $\lambda \notin \Sigma$, there exists a positive constant $C_8 = C_8(\lambda, \Theta, \Omega, c_1, C_1, \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}, F)$ such that if $f \in L^2(\Theta)$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{T}$ is a K -tuple of subunit vector fields, $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$ and $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ is the unique weak solution of problem (2.22), then one has the estimate*

$$(2.24) \quad \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} \leq C_8(\|f\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \sqrt{K}\|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(\Theta)}).$$

Proof of Theorem 2.14: We start by showing that under the current hypotheses there exists a constant $\hat{C} > 0$, independent of $u, f, K, \mathbf{T}, \mathbf{g}$, such that

$$(2.25) \quad \|u\|_{L^2(\Theta)} \leq \hat{C}(\|f\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \sqrt{K}\|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(\Theta)}).$$

To arrive at a contradiction, suppose that (2.25) is false. Then, for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$ there exist $f_n \in L^2(\Theta)$, $K_n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{g}_n \in [L^2(\Theta)]^{K_n}$, $\mathbf{T}_n$ a K_n -tuple of subunit vector fields and $u_n \in QH^1(\Theta)$ such that

$$\begin{cases} Xu_n = \lambda u_n + f_n + \mathbf{T}'_n \mathbf{g}_n & \text{in } \Theta \\ \langle \nu, P(x)\nabla u_n + u_n \mathbf{GS} - \mathbf{g}_n \mathbf{T}_n \rangle = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta, \end{cases}$$

that is

$$(2.26) \quad \mathcal{L}(u_n, v) = \int_{\Theta} \lambda u_n v + f_n v + \mathbf{g}_n \mathbf{T}_n v \, dx$$

for every $v \in QH^1(\Theta)$, and

$$\|u_n\|_{L^2(\Theta)} > n(\|f_n\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \sqrt{K_n} \|\mathbf{g}_n\|_{L^2(\Theta)}).$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that $\|u_n\|_{L^2(\Theta)} = 1$ for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$, so that

$$(2.27) \quad (\|f_n\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \sqrt{K_n} \|\mathbf{g}_n\|_{L^2(\Theta)}) < \frac{1}{n}$$

for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\gamma > 0$ be as in Theorem 2.7. Since $u_n \in QH^1(\Theta)$ is also a weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} Xu_n + \gamma u_n = (\gamma + \lambda)u_n + f_n + \mathbf{T}'_n \mathbf{g}_n & \text{in } \Theta \\ \langle \nu, P(x) \nabla u_n + u_n \mathbf{G} \mathbf{S} - \mathbf{g}_n \mathbf{T}_n \rangle = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta, \end{cases}$$

we obtain by inequality (2.10) that

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_n\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} &\leq \frac{4}{c_1} (\|(\gamma + \lambda)u_n + f_n\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \sqrt{K_n} \|\mathbf{g}_n\|_{L^2(\Theta)}) \\ &\leq \frac{4}{c_1} ((\gamma + \lambda) + 1) \end{aligned}$$

for every $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $QH^1(\Theta)$ is a Hilbert space and since $QH^1(\Theta)$ is compactly embedded in $L^2(\Theta)$ by Proposition 1.7, we can assume (up to a subsequence) that

$$(2.28) \quad \begin{aligned} (u_n, \nabla u_n) &\rightharpoonup (u, \nabla u) \quad \text{in } QH^1(\Theta), \text{ and} \\ u_n &\rightarrow u \quad \text{in } L^2(\Theta). \end{aligned}$$

Passing to the limit in (2.26) while exploiting (2.27), (2.28), and the continuity of the bilinear form $\mathcal{L}(\cdot, \cdot)$, we see that for every $v \in QH^1(\Theta)$ we have

$$\mathcal{L}(u, v) = \int_{\Theta} \lambda uv \, dx,$$

since

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\Theta} f_n v + \mathbf{g}_n \mathbf{T}_n v \, dx \right| &\leq \|f_n\|_{L^2(\Theta)} \|v\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \|\mathbf{g}_n\|_{L^2(\Theta)} \|\mathbf{T}_n v\|_{L^2(\Theta)} \\ &\leq (\|f_n\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \sqrt{K_n} \|\mathbf{g}_n\|_{L^2(\Theta)}) \|v\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} < \frac{1}{n} \|v\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} \end{aligned}$$

for every $v \in QH^1(\Theta)$. Hence, $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ is a weak solution of problem (2.23) and, since $\lambda \notin \Sigma$, we conclude that $(u, \nabla u) = (0, \mathbf{0})$. This is in contradiction with

$$\|u\|_{L^2(\Theta)} = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|u_n\|_{L^2(\Theta)} = 1$$

and, therefore, establishes inequality (2.25).

Now, if $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ is a weak solution of (2.22) it is also a weak solution of

$$\begin{cases} Xu + \gamma u = (\lambda + \gamma)u + f + \mathbf{T}' \mathbf{g} & \text{in } \Theta \\ \langle \nu, P(x) \nabla u + u \mathbf{G} \mathbf{S} - \mathbf{g} \mathbf{T} \rangle = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta, \end{cases}$$

where $\gamma > 0$ is as in Theorem 2.7. By inequalities (2.10) and (2.25) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} &\leq \frac{4}{c_1} (\|(\gamma + \lambda)u + f\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \sqrt{K} \|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(\Theta)}) \\ &\leq \frac{4}{c_1} ((\gamma + \lambda)\|u\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \|f\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \sqrt{K} \|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(\Theta)}) \\ &\leq \frac{4((\gamma + \lambda)\hat{C} + 1)}{c_1} (\|f\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \sqrt{K} \|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(\Theta)}), \end{aligned}$$

which is inequality (2.24) with $C_8 := \frac{4((\gamma+\lambda)\hat{C}+1)}{c_1}$.

□

Theorem 2.15. *Let (Ω, ρ) be a geometric homogeneous space and let Θ be a bounded domain such that $\overline{\Theta} \subset \Omega$. Assume that both the local Poincaré inequality (1.6) with $p = 2$ and the global weak Poincaré inequality (1.10) with gain $\omega > 1$ hold. Let X be a second order linear degenerate elliptic operator with rough coefficients as in (1.14) that satisfies negativity condition (1) as in Definition 1.10. Assume that $F \in L^t(\Theta)$ with $t > \omega'$ and that $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H} \in [L^q(\Theta)]^N$ with $q > 2\omega'$. Then the only weak solution $(u, \nabla u) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ of the X -Neumann Problem*

$$(2.29) \quad \begin{cases} Xu = 0 & \text{in } \Theta \\ \langle \nu, P(x)\nabla u + u\mathbf{GS} \rangle = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta \end{cases}$$

is $(u, \nabla u) = (0, \mathbf{0})$.

Proof of Theorem 2.15: We start by noticing that if $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{H} = 0$ almost everywhere in Θ ,

$$0 = \mathcal{L}(u, u) \geq c_1 \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla u, Q(x)\nabla u \rangle dx + \varepsilon \int_{\Theta} u^2 dx \geq \min\{\varepsilon, c_1\} \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}^2$$

where we have used that X satisfies negativity condition (1). Thus, in this case, we see that $(u, \nabla u) = (0, \mathbf{0})$. From this point onward, we shall assume that $\|\mathbf{G}\| + \|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} \neq 0$.

We now proceed by assuming that there is an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every $(u, \nabla u), (v, \nabla v) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ satisfying $uv \geq 0$ almost everywhere in Θ one has

$$(2.30) \quad \int_{\Theta} Fuv + \mathbf{GS}(uv) dx \geq \varepsilon \int_{\Theta} uv dx,$$

see Definition 1.10. Let $(u, \nabla u) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ be a weak solution of (2.29). Then for each $k > 0$, $(v, \nabla v) = ((u - k)^+, \chi_{\{u > k\}} \nabla u) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ is a valid test function for u , see [SW2]. Thus,

$$0 = \mathcal{L}(u, v) = \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla v, P(x)\nabla u \rangle dx + \int_{\Theta} v\mathbf{HR}u dx + \int_{\Theta} u\mathbf{GS}v dx + \int_{\Theta} Fuv dx.$$

Using Lemma 2.1 and that $uv \geq 0$ almost everywhere in Θ , (2.30) gives us:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla v, P(x)\nabla v \rangle dx &= - \int_{\Theta} \mathbf{GS}(uv) dx + \int_{\Theta} v\mathbf{GS}u dx - \int_{\Theta} v\mathbf{HR}u dx - \int_{\Theta} Fuv dx \\ &\leq -\varepsilon \int_{\Theta} uv dx + \int_{\Theta} v(\mathbf{GS}u - \mathbf{HR}u) dx \\ &\leq -\varepsilon \int_{\Theta} v^2 dx - \varepsilon k \int_{\Theta} v dx + \int_{\Theta} v(\mathbf{GS}v - \mathbf{HR}v) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Setting $\Gamma = \text{supp}(|\sqrt{Q(x)}\nabla v|)$ and $\varepsilon_0 = \min\{c_1, \varepsilon\}$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_0 \|v\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}^2 &= \varepsilon_0 \left(\int_{\Theta} |\sqrt{Q(x)}\nabla v|^2 dx + \int_{\Theta} v^2 dx \right) \\ &\leq \int_{\Theta} |\sqrt{P(x)}\nabla v|^2 dx + \varepsilon \int_{\Theta} v^2 dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Theta} |v| [|\mathbf{H}||\mathbf{R}v| + |\mathbf{G}||\mathbf{S}v|] dx. \end{aligned}$$

Since [R3, lemma 3.18] shows that

$$|\mathbf{R}v| \leq \sqrt{N} |\sqrt{Q(x)}\nabla v| \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathbf{S}v| \leq \sqrt{N} |\sqrt{Q(x)}\nabla v|$$

almost everywhere in Θ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \varepsilon_0 \|v\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}^2 &\leq \int_{\Gamma} |v| [|\mathbf{H}||\mathbf{R}v| + |\mathbf{G}||\mathbf{S}v|] dx \\ &\leq \sqrt{N} \|(|\mathbf{G}| + |\mathbf{H}|)v\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \|\sqrt{Q(x)}\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \\ &\leq \sqrt{N} \|(|\mathbf{G}| + |\mathbf{H}|)v\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \|v\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}, \end{aligned}$$

and so Hölder's inequality and (1.6) give

$$\begin{aligned} \|v\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} &\leq \frac{\sqrt{N}}{\varepsilon_0} \| |\mathbf{G}| + |\mathbf{H}| \|_{L^q(\Theta)} \|v\|_{L^{\frac{2q}{q-2}}(\Gamma)} \\ (2.31) \quad &\leq \frac{\sqrt{N}}{\varepsilon_0} \| |\mathbf{G}| + |\mathbf{H}| \|_{L^q(\Theta)} |\Gamma|^{\frac{1}{2\omega'} - \frac{1}{q}} \|v\|_{L^{2\omega}(\Theta)} \\ &\leq C_3 \frac{\sqrt{N}}{\varepsilon_0} \| |\mathbf{G}| + |\mathbf{H}| \|_{L^q(\Theta)} |\Gamma|^{\frac{1}{2\omega'} - \frac{1}{q}} \|v\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing (2.31) by $\|v\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}$ we obtain

$$(2.32) \quad |\Gamma| \geq \left(\frac{\varepsilon_0}{\sqrt{N} C_3 \| |\mathbf{G}| + |\mathbf{H}| \|_{L^q(\Theta)}} \right)^{\frac{2q\omega'}{q-2\omega'}} > 0,$$

independently of $k \in \mathbb{R}$. Now if $l = \sup_{\Theta} u > 0$, we may choose $k > 0$ and let $k \nearrow l$ to arrive at a contradiction. Indeed, v tends to 0 almost everywhere in Θ as $k \nearrow l$ and also in $L^{2\omega}(\Theta)$. By (2.31) we obtain that $(v, \nabla v)$ tends to $(0, \mathbf{0})$ in $QH^1(\Theta)$. But then (2.32) gives

$$0 = \lim_{k \rightarrow l^-} \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla v, Q(x) \nabla v \rangle dx = \lim_{k \rightarrow l^-} \int_{\{u > k\}} \langle \nabla u, Q(x) \nabla u \rangle dx > 0$$

and we have that

$$\sup_{\Theta} u \leq 0.$$

Repeating the above argument, this time with $(v, \nabla v) = ((u+k)^-, \chi_{\{u < -k\}} \nabla u) \in QH^1(\Theta)$, see [SW2], for any k satisfying $0 < k < -\inf_{\Theta} u$ we obtain that

$$\inf_{\Theta} u \geq 0.$$

We conclude that $u = 0$ almost everywhere on Θ . Thus, any weak solution of problem (2.29) is of the form $(u, \nabla u) = (0, \mathbf{h}) \in QH^1(\Theta)$. By Definition 2.6, since $(u, \nabla u) = (0, \mathbf{h})$ is a solution of (2.29), we must have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = \mathcal{L}(u, u) &= \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla u, P(x) \nabla u \rangle dx + \int_{\Theta} u \mathbf{H} \mathbf{R} u dx + \int_{\Theta} u \mathbf{G} \mathbf{S} u dx + \int_{\Theta} F u^2 dx \\ &\geq c_1 \int_{\Theta} \langle \mathbf{h}, Q(x) \mathbf{h} \rangle dx. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} = \left(\int_{\Theta} u^2 dx + \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla u, Q(x) \nabla u \rangle dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = \left(\int_{\Theta} \langle \mathbf{h}, Q(x) \mathbf{h} \rangle dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = 0.$$

We conclude that $(u, \nabla u) = (0, \mathbf{0})$, completing the proof in case (2.30) holds.

If instead there exists $\varepsilon > 0$ such that for every $(u, \nabla u), (v, \nabla v) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ satisfying $uv \geq 0$ almost everywhere in Θ one has

$$\int_{\Theta} Fuv + \mathbf{H} \mathbf{R}(uv) dx \geq \varepsilon \int_{\Theta} uv dx,$$

see Definition 1.10, then we can repeat the above argument for the adjoint homogeneous X -Neumann Problem

$$(2.33) \quad \begin{cases} X^*v = 0 & \text{in } \Theta \\ \langle \nu, P(x)\nabla v + v\mathbf{G}\mathbf{S} \rangle = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta \end{cases}$$

and conclude that it admits only the trivial weak solution $(v, \nabla v) = (0, \mathbf{0}) \in QH^1(\Theta)$. Now suppose that problem (2.29) has a nontrivial weak solution $(u, \nabla u) \in QH^1(\Theta)$, then by Theorem 2.11 also problem (2.33) must admit a nontrivial weak solution, a contradiction. Thus the only weak solution of problem (2.29) is $(u, \nabla u) = (0, \mathbf{0})$, and the proof is complete. $\square$

Corollary 2.16. *Assume the hypotheses of Theorem 2.15 hold. Then the set Σ of real eigenvalues of the X -Neumann Problem (2.23) satisfies $\Sigma \subset (0, \infty)$.*

Corollary 2.17. *Assume the hypotheses of Theorem 2.15 hold. Then $0 \notin \Sigma$ and the X -Neumann Problem (2.7) admits a unique weak solution $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ for every $f \in L^2(\Theta)$, every $K \in \mathbb{N}$, every K -tuple $\mathbf{T}$ of subunit vector fields and every $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$. Moreover there exists a constant $C > 0$, independent of u , f , K , $\mathbf{T}$ and $\mathbf{g}$, such that*

$$\|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} \leq C(\|f\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \sqrt{K}\|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(\Theta)})$$

when $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ is a weak solution of (2.7).

Proof of Corollaries 2.16 and 2.17: These corollaries are simple consequences of Theorems 2.11, 2.12 and 2.15. $\square$

Remark 2.18. *Let (Ω, ρ) be a geometric homogeneous space and let Θ be a bounded domain with $\overline{\Theta} \subset \Omega$. Assume that the Global Sobolev Inequality with gain $\sigma > 1$ holds, see (1.7), and that the local Poincaré inequality (1.6) with $p = 2$ holds. Let X be a second order linear degenerate elliptic operator with rough coefficients as in (1.14) and assume $F \in L^t(\Theta)$ with $t > \sigma'$ and $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H} \in [L^q(\Theta)]^N$ with $q > 2\sigma'$. It was shown in [R3] that negativity condition (2)-i) for the operator X , see Definition 1.11, is sufficient for the well-posedness of the Dirichlet Problem*

$$\begin{cases} Xu = f + \mathbf{T}'\mathbf{g} & \text{in } \Theta \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta, \end{cases}$$

with $f \in L^2(\Theta)$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{T}$ a K -tuple of subunit vector fields and $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$. As is shown by Example 2.21 below, negativity condition (2) for X is not sufficient for the well-posedness of the corresponding Neumann Problem (2.7).

Remark 2.19. *All the preceding results easily extend to include complex valued weak solutions and complex eigenvalues/eigenfunctions.*

Theorem 2.20. *Let (Ω, ρ) be a geometric homogeneous space and Θ be a bounded domain such that $\overline{\Theta} \subset \Omega$. Assume that the local Poincaré inequality (1.6) with $p = 2$ holds and that the global weak Poincaré inequality (1.10) with gain $\omega > 1$ hold. Let X be a second order linear degenerate elliptic operator with rough coefficients as in (1.14). Assume that $F \in L^t(\Theta)$ with $t > \omega'$ and that $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H} \in [L^q(\Theta)]^N$ with $q > 2\omega'$. If the operator X is self-adjoint (see Definition 2.9), then*

- 1) *All the eigenvalues of the X -Neumann Problem (2.23) are real, infinite and can be ordered in a monotone sequence which diverges to $+\infty$.*

2) One has

$$\lambda_1 = \min \Sigma = \min_{u \in QH^1(\Theta) \setminus \{(0, \mathbf{h})\}} \frac{\mathcal{L}(u, u)}{\left(\int_{\Theta} u^2 dx\right)}.$$

Moreover there exists an eigenfunction $(u_1, \nabla u_1) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ of the Neumann Problem (2.23) related to the eigenvalue λ_1 such that $u_1 \geq 0$ a.e. in Θ .

3) One has that

$$\lambda_2 = \min \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{L}(u, u)}{\left(\int_{\Theta} u^2 dx\right)} \mid u \in QH^1(\Theta) \setminus \{(0, \mathbf{h})\}, \int_{\Theta} uu_1 dx = 0 \right\}$$

is an eigenvalue of the Neumann Problem (2.23), with corresponding eigenfunction $(u_2, \nabla u_2) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ whose first component u_2 is orthogonal to u_1 in $L^2(\Theta)$. Recursively, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\lambda_k = \min \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{L}(u, u)}{\left(\int_{\Theta} u^2 dx\right)} \mid u \in QH^1(\Theta) \setminus \{(0, \mathbf{h})\}, \int_{\Theta} uu_j dx = 0 \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, k-1 \right\}$$

is an eigenvalue of the Neumann Problem (2.23), with corresponding eigenfunction $(u_k, \nabla u_k) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ whose first component u_k is orthogonal to u_j in $L^2(\Theta)$ for every $j = 1, \dots, k-1$.

4) $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is an eigenvalue if and only if $\lambda = \lambda_k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

5) The sequence $\{u_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^2(\Theta)$ forms a complete orthogonal system of $L^2(\Theta)$. The sequence $\{(u_k, \nabla u_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset QH^1(\Theta)$ is a an independent system of elements of $QH^1(\Theta)$, which is also a system of generators of the whole space if and only if the projection map $i : QH^1(\Theta) \rightarrow L^2(\Theta)$ is injective.

6) The X -Neumann Problem (2.22) is variational, with associated functional defined on $QH^1(\Theta)$ by

$$I(u) = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}(u, u) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{\Theta} u^2 dx - \int_{\Theta} fu + \mathbf{g} \mathbf{T} u dx.$$

Proof of Theorem 2.20: The proof of this Theorem is a standard application of functional analysis techniques, see for instance chapter 8.12 of [GT].

□

Example 2.21. Let (Ω, ρ) be a geometric homogeneous space and fix a bounded piecewise C^1 domain Θ with $\overline{\Theta} \subset \Omega$. Let $P = P(x)$ be an $n \times n$ matrix as in (1.14) and consider the following Neumann Problem

$$(2.34) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(P(x)\nabla u) = f + \mathbf{T}'\mathbf{g} & \text{in } \Theta \\ \langle \nu, P(x)\nabla u \rangle = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta, \end{cases}$$

where $f \in L^2(\Theta)$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{T}$ is a K -tuple of subunit vector fields and $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$. Assume that the following hold:

- 1) the global weak Poincaré inequality on Θ with gain $\omega > 1$, see (1.10),
- 2) the local Poincaré inequality (1.6) with $p = 2$.

Theorems 2.11, 2.12 and 2.14 apply to this problem where

$$Xu = -\operatorname{div}(P(x)\nabla u) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}(u, v) = \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla v, P(x)\nabla u \rangle dx.$$

Moreover, the problem is self adjoint so that Theorem 2.20 also applies. Let $N \subset QH^1(\Theta)$ be the subspace of weak solutions of

$$\begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(P(x)\nabla u) = 0, & \text{in } \Theta \\ \langle \nu, P(x)\nabla u \rangle = 0, & \text{on } \partial\Theta. \end{cases}$$

Obviously,

$$\{(u, \nabla u) = (c, \mathbf{0}) \in QH^1(\Theta) \mid c \in \mathbb{R}\} \subseteq N.$$

Now suppose $(u, \nabla u) \in N$. Then by Definition 2.6, for every $v \in QH^1(\Theta)$ one has

$$\mathcal{L}(u, v) = \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla v, P(x)\nabla u \rangle dx = 0.$$

In particular, choosing $(v, \nabla v) = (u, \nabla u)$,

$$\int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla u, Q(x)\nabla u \rangle dx \leq \frac{1}{c_1} \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla u, P(x)\nabla u \rangle dx = 0,$$

so that $(u, \nabla u) = (u, \mathbf{0})$ in $QH^1(\Theta)$. Applying the local Poincaré inequality (1.6) with $p = 2$, for every quasimetric ball $B_r(y) \subset \Theta$ with $\mathfrak{b}r \in (0, r_1(y))$ one has

$$\int_{B_r(y)} |u - u_{B_r(y)}| dx \leq C \left(\int_{B_{\mathfrak{b}r}(y)} |\sqrt{Q(x)}\nabla u|^2 dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = 0,$$

where $C > 0$ is independent of $(u, \nabla u) \in QH^1(\Theta)$. Hence $u = u_{B_r(y)}$ almost everywhere on $B_r(y)$. As quasimetric balls are open sets, the function $u \in L^2(\Theta)$ is locally constant in Θ . Since Θ is connected, u must therefore be constant in Θ . This proves that

$$\{(u, \nabla u) = (c, \mathbf{0}) \in QH^1(\Theta) \mid c \in \mathbb{R}\} = N.$$

By Theorem 2.11, problem (2.34) admits a weak solution $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ if and only if

$$\int_{\Theta} cf + \mathbf{g}\mathbf{T}\mathbf{0} dx = 0 \quad \text{for every } (c, \mathbf{0}) \in N,$$

i.e. if and only if

$$\int_{\Theta} f dx = 0.$$

Now it is clear that if $(u, \nabla u) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ is a weak solution of problem (2.34), then so is $(u+c, \nabla u)$ for every $c \in \mathbb{R}$. Hence it is also clear that for every $f \in L^2(\Theta)$ satisfying $\int_{\Theta} f dx = 0$, every $K \in \mathbb{N}$, every K -tuple $\mathbf{T}$ of subunit vector fields and every $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$ there exists a unique weak solution $(u, \nabla u) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ of problem (2.34) satisfying

$$\int_{\Theta} u dx = 0.$$

Claim: We claim that there exists a positive constant C so that if $f \in L^2(\Theta)$ satisfies $\int_{\Theta} f dx = 0$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{T}$ is a K -tuple of subunit vector fields, $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$ and $(u, \nabla u) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ is a weak solution of problem (2.34) with $\int_{\Theta} u dx = 0$, then

$$(2.35) \quad \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)} \leq C(\|f\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \sqrt{K}\|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(\Theta)}).$$

To see this, notice that Proposition 1.7 applies under our current assumptions and we have that the projection onto the first component is a compact mapping from $QH^1(\Theta)$ into $L^2(\Theta)$.

Therefore, we are able to apply Theorem 5.1 with $p = 2$, see Section 5, to conclude inequality (5.1) with $q = 2$. Thus,

$$\int_{\Theta} u^2 dx = \int_{\Theta} |u - u_{\Theta}|^2 dx \leq C_5 \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla u, Q(x) \nabla u \rangle dx.$$

It is now easy to see that

$$(2.36) \quad \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}^2 \leq (C_5 + 1) \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla u, Q(x) \nabla u \rangle dx.$$

Using that $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ is a weak solution of (2.34) together with the subuniticity of $\mathbf{T}$, we have

$$(2.37) \quad \begin{aligned} \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla u, Q(x) \nabla u \rangle dx &\leq \frac{1}{c_1} \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla u, P(x) \nabla u \rangle dx \\ &= \frac{1}{c_1} \int_{\Theta} fu + \mathbf{g} \mathbf{T} u dx \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c_1} (\|f\|_{L^2(\Theta)} \|u\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(\Theta)} \|\mathbf{T} u\|_{L^2(\Theta)}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c_1} (\|f\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \sqrt{K} \|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(\Theta)}) \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus (2.36) and (2.37) together yield (2.35), proving our claim with $C = \frac{C_5+1}{c_1}$. Furthermore, (2.36) also shows that

$$\int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla u, Q(x) \nabla u \rangle dx \leq \|u\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}^2 \leq (C_5 + 1) \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla u, Q(x) \nabla u \rangle dx$$

for every $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ with $\int_{\Theta} u dx = 0$. Therefore, the norm

$$\|u\|_{QH_*^1(\Theta)} = \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla u, Q(x) \nabla u \rangle dx,$$

is equivalent to $\|\cdot\|_{QH^1(\Theta)}$ on the subspace $QH_*^1(\Theta) \subset QH^1(\Theta)$ defined by

$$QH_*^1(\Theta) = \left\{ u \in QH^1(\Theta) \mid \int_{\Theta} u dx = 0 \right\} = N^{\perp}.$$

We also mention that Theorem 2.15 shows that the problem

$$(2.38) \quad \begin{cases} -\operatorname{div}(P(x) \nabla u) = \lambda u + f + \mathbf{T}' \mathbf{g} & \text{in } \Theta \\ \langle \nu, P(x) \nabla u \rangle = 0 & \text{on } \partial \Theta, \end{cases}$$

with $\lambda < 0$ admits a unique weak solution $u \in QH^1(\Theta)$ for every $f \in L^2(\Theta)$, every $K \in \mathbb{N}$, every K -tuple $\mathbf{T}$ of subunit vector fields and every $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$. Hence, all eigenvalues of problem (2.38) must be nonnegative with $\lambda_1 = \min \Sigma = 0$ where $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}$ is the set of eigenvalues of problem (2.38). Furthermore, the eigenvalue λ_1 is simple. Since problem (2.38) is self-adjoint, its eigenvalues form a monotone sequence diverging to $+\infty$. The corresponding eigenfunctions $\{(u_k, \nabla u_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset QH^1(\Theta)$ form an independent system of elements such that $\{u_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^2(\Theta)$ is a complete orthogonal system. Moreover, one can choose $(u_1, \nabla u_1) = (1, \mathbf{0}) \in QH^1(\Theta)$. If the projection map $i : QH^1(\Theta) \rightarrow L^2(\Theta)$ is injective, then the eigenfunctions $\{(u_k, \nabla u_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ are also a system of generators of $QH^1(\Theta)$.

One has that $(u, \nabla u) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ is a solution of problem (2.38) if and only if it is a critical point of the functional $I : QH^1(\Theta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$I(u) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla u, P(x) \nabla u \rangle dx - \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{\Theta} u^2 dx - \int_{\Theta} fu + \mathbf{g} \mathbf{T} u dx.$$

Finally, if $P(x) = Q(x)$ almost everywhere in Θ one can show that $\{(u_k, \nabla u_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset QH^1(\Theta)$ is an orthogonal system. Indeed, for every $k \neq j$, $k, j \in \mathbb{N}$, one has

$$\int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla u_k, Q(x) \nabla u_j \rangle dx = \mathcal{L}(u_j, u_k) = \lambda_j \int_{\Theta} u_j u_k dx = 0.$$

Hence for every $k \neq j$, $k, j \in \mathbb{N}$, we obtain

$$(u_j, u_k)_{QH^1(\Theta)} = \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla u_j, Q(x) \nabla u_k \rangle dx + \int_{\Theta} u_j u_k dx = 0,$$

as claimed.

The results on the Neumann Problem (2.34) described above extend and complete previous results on such problems obtained in [R1].

3. SPECTRAL RESULTS FOR THE X -DIRICHLET PROBLEM

In this section we give a spectral theorem related to X -Dirichlet problems (that is, Dirichlet problems associated to the operator X with rough coefficients as in (1.14)). Existence results for X -Dirichlet problems are given in [R3] and we refer the interested reader there for statements and proofs. We begin by recalling the definition of weak solution related to the X -Dirichlet Problem on a bounded domain with homogeneous boundary data as given in [R3].

Definition 3.1. Let X be a second order linear degenerate elliptic operator with rough coefficients as in (1.14). Assume that the global Sobolev inequality with gain $\sigma > 1$ holds, see (1.7). Let $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H} \in [L^q(\Theta)]^N$ with $q \geq 2\sigma'$ and let $F \in L^t(\Theta)$ with $t \geq \sigma'$. If $f \in L^2(\Theta)$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{T}$ is a K -tuple of subunit vector fields and $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$, a function $(u, \nabla u) \in QH_0^1(\Theta)$ is a weak solution of the Dirichlet Problem

$$(3.1) \quad \begin{cases} Xu = f + \mathbf{T}'\mathbf{g} & \text{in } \Theta \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta \end{cases}$$

if and only if

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{L}(u, v) = \int_{\Theta} f v + \mathbf{g} \mathbf{T} v dx \quad \text{for all } v \in QH_0^1(\Theta).$$

Theorem 3.2. Let (Ω, ρ) be a geometric homogeneous space and let Θ be a bounded domain such that $\bar{\Theta} \subset \Omega$. Assume that the local Poincaré inequality (1.6) holds with $p = 2$ and that the global Sobolev inequality (1.7) with gain $\sigma > 1$ holds. Let X be a second order linear degenerate elliptic operator with rough coefficients as in (1.14). Assume that $F \in L^t(\Theta)$ with $t > \sigma'$ and that $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H} \in [L^q(\Theta)]^N$ with $q > 2\sigma'$. Then each of the following hold.

- 1) There exists an at most countable set $\Sigma \subset \mathbb{R}$ such that the X -Dirichlet problem

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{cases} Xu = \lambda u + f + \mathbf{T}'\mathbf{g} & \text{in } \Theta \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta \end{cases}$$

admits a unique weak solution $u \in QH_0^1(\Theta)$ for every $f \in L^2(\Theta)$, every $K \in \mathbb{N}$, every K -tuple $\mathbf{T}$ of subunit vector fields and every $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$ if and only if $\lambda \notin \Sigma$.

- 2) If Σ is infinite, its elements can be arranged in a monotone sequence diverging to $+\infty$.
- 3) If $\lambda \notin \Sigma$ there exists a constant $C = C(\lambda, \Theta, \Omega, c_1, C_1, \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H}, F) > 0$ such that

$$\|u\|_{QH_0^1(\Theta)} \leq C(\|f\|_{L^2(\Theta)} + \sqrt{K} \|\mathbf{g}\|_{L^2(\Theta)})$$

whenever $f \in L^2(\Theta)$, $K \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbf{T}$ is a K -tuple of subunit vector fields, $\mathbf{g} \in [L^2(\Theta)]^K$ and $u \in QH_0^1(\Theta)$ is a weak solution of (3.1).

- 4) If $\lambda \in \Sigma$, let $N \subset QH_0^1(\Theta)$ be the subspace of weak solutions of the X -Dirichlet Problem

$$\begin{cases} Xu = \lambda u & \text{in } \Theta \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta, \end{cases}$$

and let $N^* \subset QH_0^1(\Theta)$ be the subspace of weak solutions of the adjoint problem

$$\begin{cases} X^*u = \lambda u & \text{in } \Theta \\ u = 0 & \text{on } \partial\Theta. \end{cases}$$

Then $1 \leq \dim N = \dim N^* < \infty$ and problem (3.1) admits a weak solution $u \in QH_0^1(\Theta)$ if and only if

$$\int_{\Theta} f v + \mathbf{g} \mathbf{T} v \, dx = 0 \quad \text{for all } v \in N^*.$$

- 5) If X satisfies negativity condition (2), see Definition 1.11, then $\Sigma \subset (0, \infty)$.
 6) If X is self-adjoint (that is, if $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{R} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{S}$ almost everywhere in Θ), then all eigenvalues of X are real, Σ is infinite and we have the following variational characterization of the eigenvalues of X :

$$\lambda_1 = \min \Sigma = \min_{u \in QH_0^1(\Theta) \setminus \{(0, \mathbf{h})\}} \frac{\mathcal{L}(u, u)}{\left(\int_{\Theta} u^2 \, dx\right)},$$

and there exists an eigenfunction $(u_1, \nabla u_1) \in QH_0^1(\Theta)$ of the X -Dirichlet Problem (3.1) related to the eigenvalue λ_1 for whom $u_1 \geq 0$ a.e. in Θ . Furthermore,

$$\lambda_2 = \min \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{L}(u, u)}{\left(\int_{\Theta} u^2 \, dx\right)} \mid u \in QH_0^1(\Theta) \setminus \{(0, \mathbf{h})\}, \int_{\Theta} u u_1 \, dx = 0 \right\},$$

with corresponding eigenfunction $(u_2, \nabla u_2) \in QH_0^1(\Theta)$ where u_2 is orthogonal to u_1 in $L^2(\Theta)$. Recursively, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\lambda_k = \min \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{L}(u, u)}{\left(\int_{\Theta} u^2 \, dx\right)} \mid u \in QH_0^1(\Theta) \setminus \{(0, \mathbf{h})\}, \int_{\Theta} u u_j \, dx = 0 \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, k-1 \right\},$$

with corresponding eigenfunction $(u_k, \nabla u_k) \in QH_0^1(\Theta)$, where u_k is orthogonal to u_j in $L^2(\Theta)$ for every $j = 1, \dots, k-1$. Moreover, $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ is an eigenvalue if and only if $\lambda = \lambda_k$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. The sequence $\{u_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset L^2(\Theta)$ forms a complete orthogonal system of $L^2(\Theta)$. The sequence $\{(u_k, \nabla u_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \subset QH_0^1(\Theta)$ is an independent system of elements of $QH_0^1(\Theta)$, which is also a system of generators of $QH_0^1(\Theta)$ if and only if the projection map $i : QH_0^1(\Theta) \rightarrow L^2(\Theta)$ is injective. Finally, problem (3.3) is variational with associated functional defined on $QH_0^1(\Theta)$ by

$$I(u) = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L}(u, u) - \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_{\Theta} u^2 \, dx - \int_{\Theta} f u + \mathbf{g} \mathbf{T} u \, dx.$$

Proof of Theorem 3.2: The proof of this theorem is similar to the proofs of the preceding section where the global Poincaré inequality (1.10) with gain $\omega > 1$ is replaced with the global Sobolev inequality (1.7) when necessary. We therefore omit the proof. $\square$

4. A MAXIMUM PRINCIPLE FOR SECOND ORDER LINEAR DEGENERATE ELLIPTIC EQUATIONS WITH ROUGH COEFFICIENTS

This section contains a maximum principle for weak solutions of the differential inequality $Xu \leq 0$ for second order degenerate elliptic operators X with rough coefficients. To this end, we fix a geometric homogeneous space (Ω, ρ) with Ω as in Section 1. We also fix an $n \times n$ matrix $Q(x)$ as in Section 1 and let Θ be a bounded domain satisfying $\bar{\Theta} \subset \Omega$. Furthermore, in order to avoid confusion we will refer to an element of $QH^1(\Theta)$ by writing $\mathbf{u} \in QH^1(\Theta)$ where $\mathbf{u} = (u, \nabla u)$. We begin by giving the definition of weak solution of $X\mathbf{u} \leq 0$ in Θ .

Definition 4.1. We say that $\mathbf{u} \in QH^1(\Theta)$ is a weak solution of

$$(4.1) \quad X\mathbf{u} \leq 0 \quad \text{in } \Theta$$

if and only if $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \leq 0$ for every $\mathbf{v} = (v, \nabla v) \in QH_0^1(\Theta)$ satisfying $v \geq 0$ almost everywhere in Θ .

In order to state our maximum principle, we define a notion of non-positivity for the first component u of an element $\mathbf{u} = (u, \nabla u) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ in terms of membership in the space $QH_0^1(\Theta)$. At this time it is useful to recall that if $\mathbf{u} = (u, \nabla u) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ ($QH_0^1(\Theta)$ respectively) then, as is shown in [SW2], $\mathbf{u}^+ = (u^+, \chi_{\{u>0\}} \nabla u) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ ($QH_0^1(\Theta)$ respectively).

Definition 4.2.

- (1) We say that $\mathbf{u} = (u, \nabla u) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ satisfies $u \leq 0$ on $\partial\Theta$ if and only if

$$\mathbf{u}^+ = (u^+, \chi_{\{u>0\}} \nabla u) \in QH_0^1(\Theta).$$

- (2) We say that $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in QH^1(\Theta)$ satisfy $u \leq v$ on $\partial\Theta$ if and only if $u - v \leq 0$ on $\partial\Theta$ in the sense of item (1).
 (3) For each $k \in \mathbb{R}$ recall that $\mathbf{k} = (k, 0) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ as Θ is bounded. Thus, for $\mathbf{u} = (u, \nabla u) \in QH^1(\Theta)$ we define

$$\sup_{\partial\Theta} u = \inf \{k \in \mathbb{R} \mid u \leq k \text{ on } \partial\Theta\}, \text{ and } \inf_{\partial\Theta} u = -\sup_{\partial\Theta} (-u).$$

Theorem 4.3. *Noting the first paragraph of this section, assume that the local Poincaré inequality (1.6) with $p = 2$ holds and that the global Sobolev inequality (1.7) with gain $\sigma > 1$ holds. Let X be a second order linear degenerate elliptic operator with rough coefficients as in (1.14) that satisfies negativity condition (2)–i), see Definition 1.11. Assume that $F \in L^t(\Theta)$ with $t > \sigma'$ and that $\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{H} \in [L^q(\Theta)]^N$ with $q > 2\sigma'$. If $\mathbf{u} \in QH^1(\Theta)$ is a weak solution of (4.1) then*

$$\sup_{\Theta} u \leq \sup_{\partial\Theta} u^+.$$

Proof of Theorem 4.3: We argue by contradiction. Let $l = \sup_{\Theta} u$, let $m = \sup_{\partial\Theta} u^+$ and suppose that $l > m$. Fix $k \in \mathbb{R}$ with $m < k < l$ and set $\mathbf{v}_k = (v_k, \nabla v_k) = ((u - k)^+, \chi_{\{u>k\}} \nabla u) \in QH^1(\Theta)$. Since $k > m$ and since $m \geq 0$, it is not difficult to see that $\mathbf{v}_k \in QH_0^1(\Theta)$ by Definition 4.2. Moreover, $v_k \geq 0$ almost everywhere in Θ . Thus, $uv_k \geq 0$ almost everywhere in Θ , and an application of Lemma 2.1 implies that $\mathbf{G}\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}_k) = u\mathbf{G}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{v}_k + v_k\mathbf{G}\mathbf{S}\mathbf{u}$ and $\mathbf{H}\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}_k) = u\mathbf{H}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{v}_k + v_k\mathbf{H}\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$.

Consider now the case where $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{H} = 0$ almost everywhere on Θ . Using that X satisfies negativity condition (2)–i) and that $\nabla v_k = \nabla u$ a.e. on the support of ∇v_k , the definition of

weak solution of (4.1) yields

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}_k) = \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla v_k, P(x) \nabla u \rangle dx + \int_{\Theta} F u v_k dx \\ &\geq \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla v_k, P(x) \nabla v_k \rangle dx \geq c_1 \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla v_k, Q(x) \nabla v_k \rangle dx. \end{aligned}$$

By the global Sobolev inequality (1.7) we see that $\mathbf{v}_k = (0, \mathbf{0})$ in $QH_0^1(\Theta)$. This in turn implies that $v_k = (u - k)^+ = 0$ in $L^2(\Theta)$ and hence that $u \leq k$ almost everywhere in Θ , contradicting our assumption $k < \sup_{\Theta} u$.

We now focus on the case where $\|\mathbf{G}\| + \|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} \neq 0$. Since X satisfies negativity condition (2)-i), we argue as in the proof of Theorem 2.15 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla v_k, P(x) \nabla v_k \rangle dx &= \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla v_k, P(x) \nabla u \rangle dx \\ &\leq \int_{\Theta} |v_k| (|\mathbf{G}| |\mathbf{S} \mathbf{v}_k| + |\mathbf{H}| |\mathbf{R} \mathbf{v}_k|) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Recalling the result of [R3, Lemma 3.18] and setting $\Gamma = \text{supp}(|\sqrt{Q(x)} \nabla v_k|)$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{v}_k\|_{QH_0^1(\Theta)}^2 &\leq \frac{1}{c_1} \int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla v_k, P(x) \nabla v_k \rangle dx \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{N}}{c_1} \|(|\mathbf{G}| + |\mathbf{H}|) v_k\|_{L^2(\Gamma)} \left(\int_{\Theta} \langle \nabla v_k, Q(x) \nabla v_k \rangle dx \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{N}}{c_1} \|\mathbf{G}\| + \|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} \|v_k\|_{L^{\frac{2q}{q-2}}(\Gamma)} \|\mathbf{v}_k\|_{QH_0^1(\Theta)} \\ (4.2) \quad &\leq \frac{\sqrt{N}}{c_1} \|\mathbf{G}\| + \|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} |\Gamma|^{\frac{1}{2\sigma'} - \frac{1}{q}} \|v_k\|_{L^{2\sigma}(\Theta)} \|\mathbf{v}_k\|_{QH_0^1(\Theta)} \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{N}\tilde{C}}{c_1} \|\mathbf{G}\| + \|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} |\Gamma|^{\frac{1}{2\sigma'} - \frac{1}{q}} \|\mathbf{v}_k\|_{QH_0^1(\Theta)}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing through by $\|\mathbf{v}_k\|_{QH_0^1(\Theta)}^2$ we have

$$(4.3) \quad |\Gamma| \geq \left(\frac{c_1}{\sqrt{N}\tilde{C} \|\mathbf{G}\| + \|\mathbf{H}\|_{L^q(\Theta)}} \right)^{\frac{2q\sigma'}{q-2\sigma'}} > 0$$

independently of k , for $m < k < l$. As in Theorem 2.15, sending $k \rightarrow l^-$ gives a contradiction and we conclude that

$$\sup_{\Theta} u \leq \sup_{\partial\Theta} u^+.$$

□

5. POINCARÉ INEQUALITIES AND COMPACT PROJECTION OF SOBOLEV SPACES

In this section we give a result demonstrating a global Poincaré inequality with gain as a consequence of a compact “embedding”-type property for degenerate Sobolev spaces. We say that the *Compact Projection Property* from $QH^{1,p}(\Theta)$ into $L^q(\Theta)$ holds if and only if the projection map $i : QH^{1,p}(\Theta) \rightarrow L^q(\Theta)$ defined by $i((u, \nabla u)) = u$ is a compact mapping. Recall that the space $QH^{1,p}(\Theta)$ is defined as the closure in the norm

$$\|w\|_{QH^{1,p}(\Theta)} = \|w\|_{L^p(\Theta)} + \|\sqrt{Q(x)} \nabla w\|_{L^p(\Theta)}$$

of the collection $Lip_{Q,p}(\Theta)$ of locally Lipschitz functions defined in Θ with finite $QH^{1,p}(\Theta)$ norm. Note that $QH^{1,p}(\Theta)$ is denoted by $W_Q^{1,p}(\Theta)$ in [MRW], [CRW], and as $W_Q^{1,p}(\Theta)$ in [SW2].

Theorem 5.1. *Let (Ω, ρ) be a geometric homogeneous space, Θ be a bounded domain such that $\overline{\Theta} \subset \Omega$ and fix p, q with $1 \leq p \leq q < \infty$. Assume that the local Poincaré inequality (1.6) of order p holds. If the Compact Projection Property from $QH^{1,p}(\Theta)$ to $L^q(\Theta)$ holds, there exists a positive constant $C_5 > 0$ such that*

$$(5.1) \quad \left(\int_{\Theta} |w - w_{\Theta}|^r dx \right)^{\frac{1}{r}} \leq C_5 \left(\int_{\Theta} |\sqrt{Q} \nabla w|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$$

for every $r \in [1, q]$ and pair $(w, \nabla w) \in QH^{1,p}(\Theta)$.

Corollary 5.2. *Assume that the conditions of Theorem 5.1 hold with $p = 2$. Then, the global Poincaré inequality (1.9) holds (and also the global weak Poincaré inequality (1.10)) with gain $\omega = \frac{q}{2}$.*

Remark 5.3. *When put in context with Remark 1.5, Proposition 1.7 (when $p = 2$) and related results of [CRW], one can see a clear relationship, vis-a-vis almost necessity and sufficiency, between the compact projection property and the Poincaré inequality (5.1) in the setting of a geometric homogeneous space where a local Poincaré inequality of the form (1.6) holds.*

Proof of Theorem 5.1: We argue by contradiction and begin with the case where $r = q \geq p$. If the result does not hold, then for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there is a $w_k \in QH^{1,p}(\Theta)$ so that

$$(5.2) \quad \left(\int_{\Theta} |w_k - (w_k)_{\Theta}|^q dx \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} > k \left(\int_{\Theta} |\sqrt{Q} \nabla w_k|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}},$$

where $(w_k)_{\Theta} = \frac{1}{|\Theta|} \int_{\Theta} w_k dx$. Thus, $\|w_k - (w_k)_{\Theta}\|_{L^q(\Theta)} > 0$ and we are able to define

$$v_k = \frac{w_k - (w_k)_{\Theta}}{\|w_k - (w_k)_{\Theta}\|_{L^q(\Theta)}}.$$

It is clear that both

$$\|v_k\|_{L^q(\Theta)} = 1, \quad (v_k)_{\Theta} = 0,$$

and

$$\left(\int_{\Theta} |\sqrt{Q} \nabla v_k|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \frac{1}{k}$$

hold. Since $q \geq p$ and Θ is bounded, the sequence $\{(v_k, \nabla v_k)\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ is bounded in $QH^{1,p}(\Theta)$. By the Compact Projection Property there exists $v \in L^q(\Theta)$ so that, up to a subsequence, $v_k \rightarrow v$ pointwise a.e. in Θ and also in $L^q(\Theta)$. It is not difficult to see that the limit v satisfies

$$(5.3) \quad \|v\|_{L^q(\Theta)} = 1, \quad v_{\Theta} = 0.$$

Applying the local Poincaré inequality (1.6) to v_k gives

$$(5.4) \quad \frac{1}{|B_r|} \int_{B_r} |v_k - (v_k)_{B_r}| dx \leq C_2 r \left(\frac{1}{|B_{br}|} \int_{B_{br}} |\sqrt{Q} \nabla v_k|^p dx \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} < \frac{C_2 r}{|B_{br}|^{\frac{1}{p}}} \frac{1}{k}$$

for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and every $B_r = B(y, r)$ such that $br \in (0, r_1(y))$ and $\overline{B_{br}} \subset \Theta$. Passing to the limit as k tends to ∞ we get

$$\|v - v_{B_r}\|_{L^1(B_r)} = 0$$

and so v is a.e. constant on B_r . Since quasimetric balls are open, v is locally constant in the connected set Θ and we conclude that

$$v \equiv \text{const.} \quad \text{a.e. in } \Theta.$$

This contradicts (5.3) and proves (5.1) when $r = q$. Since Θ is bounded, we can recover inequality (5.1) in the case $r \in [1, q)$ by a simple application of Hölder's inequality. $\square$

Remark 5.4. *Theorem 5.1 is improved by replacing the local Poincaré inequality of order $p \geq 1$ with its weaker $L^1 \rightarrow L^p$ counterpart obtained by replacing p with 1 on the left-hand side of (1.6). The proof of this improved version is identical to the one just given n.b. (5.4).*

REFERENCES

- [CRW] S.-K. Chua, S. Rodney and R. L. Wheeden, A compact embedding theorem for generalized Sobolev spaces, ArXiv:1110.6907v1, 2011.
- [E] L. C. Evans, Partial Differential Equations, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, Vol. 19, AMS (Year).
- [FKS] E. B. Fabes, C. Kenig and R. Serapioni, The local regularity of solutions of degenerate elliptic equations, Comm. P.D.E. 7 (1982), pp. 77-116.
- [HK] P. Hajlasz and P. Koskela, Sobolev met Poincaré, Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 145 (2000), no. 688.
- [HyK] T. Hytönen and A. Kairema, Systems of dyadic cubes in a doubling metric space, Colloq. Math. 126 (2012), no. 1, pp. 133.
- [HyM] T. Hytönen and H. Martikainen, Non-homogeneous Tb theorem and random dyadic cubes on metric measure spaces, J. Geom. Anal. 22 (2012), no. 4, pp. 1071-1107.
- [J] D. Jerison, The Poincaré inequality for vector fields satisfying Hörmanders condition, Duke Math. J. 53 (1986), pp. 503-523.
- [M1] D. D. Monticelli, Maximum principles and applications for a class of degenerate linear operators, Ph.D. thesis, Università degli Studi di Milano, Italy, 2006.
- [M2] D. D. Monticelli, Maximum Principles and the method of Moving Planes for a class of Degenerate Elliptic Linear Operators, J. Eur. Math. Soc. 12 (2010), pp. 611-654.
- [MP] D. D. Monticelli, K. R. Payne, Maximum principles for weak solutions of degenerate elliptic equations with a uniformly elliptic direction, J. Diff. Eq. 247 (2009), no. 7, pp. 1993-2026.
- [MRW] D. D. Monticelli, S. Rodney, and R. L. Wheeden, Boundedness of weak solutions of degenerate quasilinear equations with rough coefficients, J. Diff. and Int. Eq., Vol. 25, No. 1-2 (2012), pp. 143-200.
- [MS] N. Meyers and J. Serrin, $H=W$, Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. vol. 51 (1964), pp. 1055-1056.
- [SW1] E. T. Sawyer and R. L. Wheeden, Hölder continuity of weak solutions to subelliptic equations with rough coefficients, Memoirs Amer. Math. Soc. 847 (2006).
- [SW2] E. T. Sawyer and R. L. Wheeden, Degenerate Sobolev spaces and regularity of subelliptic equations, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 362 no. 4 (2010), pp. 1869-1906.
- [R1] S. Rodney, Existence of weak solutions to subelliptic partial differential equations in divergence form and the necessity of Sobolev and Poincaré inequalities, Ph.D. Thesis, McMaster University, Canada, (2007).
- [R2] S. Rodney, A degenerate Sobolev inequality for a large set in a homogeneous space, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 362 (2010), pp. 673-685.
- [R3] S. Rodney, Existence of weak solutions of linear subelliptic Dirichlet problems with rough coefficients, Can. J. Math. Vol. 64 no. 6 (2012), pp. 1395-1414.
- [GT] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger, Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order, Springer Verlag, 1998.

E-mail address: dario.monticelli@gmail.com (Dario Daniele Monticelli)

E-mail address: scott.rodney@gmail.com (Scott Rodney)